```
United States District Court
 1
                    Southern District of California
 2
 3
 4
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 5
                     Plaintiff,
 6
                                    ) Case No. 10-CR-4246 JM
         vs.
                                    ) Jury Trial/Day 2
 7
    BASAALY SAEED MOALIN,
                                   ) Tuesday, January 29, 2013
     MOHAMAD MOHAMUD
 8
                                    ) Volume 2
     ISSA DOREH,
     AHMED NASIR TAALIL MOHAMUD,
 9
                     Defendants.
10
11
                Before the Honorable Jeffrey T. Miller
12
                      United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
     Official Interpreters: Ayderus Ali, CCI
                              Fanik Jama, CCI
21
     Official Court Reporter: Debra M. Henson, CSR, RPR
22
                              U.S. Courthouse
                              221 W. Broadway, Suite 5190
23
                              San Diego, CA 92101
                               (619) 238-4538
24
25
               Record produced by stenographic reporter
```

1	Appearances	
2	For the Government:	UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
3 4		William P. Cole Caroline P. Han ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS
5		Steven P. Ward, Trial Attorney U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
6		880 Front Street, Suite 6293 San Diego, CA 92101
7	For the Defendants:	
8	(Mr. Moalin)	Joshua L. Dratel, Esq. Alice Fontier, Esq. OFFICE OF JOSHUA L. DRATEL
9		2 Wall Street, Third Floor New York, NY 10005
10	(Mr. M. Mohamud)	Linda Moreno, Esq. LINDA MORENO, P.A.
12		P.O. Box 10985 Tampa, FL 33679
13	(Mr. Doreh)	Ahmed Ghappour, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF AHMED GHAPPOUR
14		P.O. Box 20367 Seattle, WA 98102
15 16	(Mr. A. Mohamud)	Thomas A. Durkin, Esq. Janis Roberts, Esq.
17		DURKIN & ROBERTS 2446 N. Clark Street Chicago, IL 60614
18		onioago, ii oooii
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

San Diego, California - Tuesday, January 29, 2013 1 2 (The following proceedings were had outside the presence 3 of the jury panel.) 4 THE CLERK: Calling matter 1 on calendar, 5 10-CR-4246, USA versus Basaaly Saeed Moalin, Mohamad Mohamad 6 Mohamud, Issa Doreh, Ahmed Nasir Taalil Mohamud, set for jury 7 trial. MR. COLE: Good morning, your Honor. William Cole, 8 Caroline Han, and Steven Ward for the United States. 9 10 MR. DRATEL: Good morning, your Honor. Joshua 11 Dratel and Alice Fontier for Mr. Moalin. 12 MS. FONTIER: Good morning, your Honor. 13 MS. MORENO: Good morning, Judge. Linda Moreno on behalf of Mr. Mohamud. 14 15 MR. DURKIN: Good morning, Judge. Tom Durkin and Janis Roberts on behalf Ahmed Nasir Taalil Mohamud. 16 17 THE COURT: Very good. Thank you. From this point 18 forward, I will always appreciate everyone being here in a timely fashion for all sessions of court so we can get 19 20 started right on the spot; I appreciate your cooperation in 21 that regard. 22 The jurors who are returning, as you probably know, 23 are assembling -- I don't think we need any of the defendants 24 at this point; this is just scheduling -- they're assembling

in Courtroom 15 up on the fifth floor. Roll will be taken up

25

there, making sure we have everyone. Then we'll have them brought down here and we will proceed to place them in their assigned seats.

Good morning, Mr. Ghappour. I was just indicating to everyone that I really would appreciate everyone being here promptly for each session so we can get started on time and keep the case moving.

In any event, hopefully we haven't lost anyone.

When the jurors report here -- Mr. Ghappour, I was just indicating they will be taking their assigned seats, and then I'll have some general questions for them, and I will proceed to address each one of them individually. We'll be working with a 36-pack initially. And, once again, my part of it will take a significant period of time, and then of course counsel will participate in voir dire as well.

members will be excused for cause or any other reason, then we will substitute for that individual at that time and in the order in which they have been randomized on the list that you all have. So that's pretty much what the procedure is going to be. Mr. Dratel, you see -- there's a querulous look on your face.

MR. DRATEL: There is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DRATEL: May I just consult with Ms. Moreno for

```
a second?
 1
               THE COURT: Sure.
 2
 3
               MS. MORENO: I have two questions, two quick
 4
     questions, your Honor. Is the voir dire then only going to
 5
    be aimed at the jurors -- at the panel members in the box?
 6
               THE COURT: No, all 36.
 7
               MS. MORENO: All 36. You'll be voir diring all 36?
                          Right. We're working with a 36-pack
 8
               THE COURT:
 9
    because obviously --
10
               MS. MORENO: That's what I thought.
               THE COURT: -- juror number 36 can ultimately be
11
     sworn in as a juror, an alternate perhaps --
12
13
               MS. MORENO: Exactly.
14
               THE COURT: -- as well as anyone else. So it will
15
    be a 36-pack we're working with.
16
               MS. MORENO: And, your Honor, what protocol would
17
    you like me to follow in terms of -- after your Honor is done
18
    and when it's -- and Mr. Cole is done and I do my voir dire,
19
    whenever that occurs, if I feel that on a particular juror I
20
     feel I've made the cause record, let's say, can I then
21
     approach your Honor -- I mean how do you want me to handle
2.2
     that?
23
               THE COURT: Yes. First of all, your voir dire will
24
    go first before Mr. Cole's, okay, and I assume you're
25
    proceeding for yourself or everyone?
```

1 MS. MORENO: For everyone. 2 THE COURT: For everyone as your voir dire. 3 you'll go first, Mr. Cole will -- oh, Mr. Ward? Mr. Ward? 4 MR. WARD: Yes, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: I saw Mr. Cole hand off the football, 6 and I didn't know whether it was to you or Ms. Han, okay, so 7 you'll be going after Ms. Moreno. 8 And with respect to cause, after both sides are done with their voir dire -- well, after the Court's voir 9 10 dire is done and voir dire of counsel, then we'll just have a 11 bit of a session here at the side of the bench if jurors are still in our midst, which is probably unlikely, but outside 12 13 the presence of the panel, and then challenges for cause can 14 be made then. 15 MS. MORENO: I guess my question then, your Honor, 16 is --17 THE COURT: Not after each one. 18 MS. MORENO: Not after each one. Because I won't 19 know then what the Court's ruling is with respect to my 20 record on cause, and I don't want to waste time if I believe 21 I've established my record. 22 THE COURT: Well, establish your record and ask 23 your questions, and then if you feel that you've got it, then 24 you know, go on to the next one. I don't know what you're

25

really referring to when --

MS. MORENO: Well, I just -- if I can offer, my experience is usually -- and that's why I asked; I'm glad I did -- is after a juror -- if I believe I've made the cause record, I would challenge that juror for cause either at the bench with your Honor and after each one, not at the end -- that's what I'm saying -- because depending upon the configuration, I could go a shorter period of time or a longer period of time. But if the Court wants me to wait until I'm completely done --

THE COURT: If you would. I think it just makes for a much better flow. And I've certainly done it in that fashion for a long, long time, I'll put it that way.

MS. MORENO: I'm open to the new experience, your Honor. Thank you.

MR. COLE: We just want to mention one thing before our voir dire, which is we've been reflecting since our last hearing on Friday on how to deal with this issue the Court expressed further concern about regarding al-Qaeda, and I know it may come up in voir dire, so I wanted to let counsel know and the Court know that we've decided that we can put on our evidence and our opening without referring to al-Qaeda and that any reference to things in Aden Ayrow's background that he became well-known for can be described without referencing the fact that it was linked to al-Qaeda. In other words, the event can be described without attributing

```
it as a link to al-Qaeda, and so we won't use the words
 1
 2
     "al-Qaeda."
 3
               The only possible complication is if -- we don't
 4
     know what cross-examination will be and how Mr. Bryden may or
 5
    may not be impeached as to the reasons he knows something or
 6
    why he believed something happened. It could become
 7
     difficult for him to explain the basis of his opinions and
    reasons, but in our case we're not going to --
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Well, I didn't -- okay.
10
               MR. COLE:
                          I just wanted to -- I've been worried
11
     that voir dire might start with people not knowing that.
12
               THE COURT: I didn't want to get into this kind of
13
     an issue.
14
               MR. COLE: Sorry.
15
               THE COURT: I appreciate -- no, no, I appreciate
16
     your bringing it up as a head's up, and -- the defendants
17
     aren't here; I didn't want to get into any of the merits --
               MR. COLE: Okay.
18
19
               THE COURT: -- or substantive issues, not that -- I
20
     realize what you're saying; this is not a matter of any great
21
    moment, but if we're going to bring up matters like that, I
22
    would have the defendants out here. Up until now it's was
23
     just kind of a little bit of procedural --
24
               MR. COLE: I apologize, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: That's okay. No need to apologize.
```

```
think you made your point though. Are there any other
 1
 2
    matters of that type that need to be addressed? I just --
 3
               MR. DURKIN: Judge, there is an issue, although I
 4
    was hoping the defendants would be here now to --
 5
               THE COURT: Well, then stop. Let's bring the
 6
    defendants out.
 7
               MS. MORENO: I read Edmonson v. Leesville, your
 8
    Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: Did you see the passage? It was a
10
    novel -- it was a novel thought, I must say, and it really
11
    resonated.
12
               MS. MORENO: It was a landmark case.
13
               THE COURT: That opinion came down in '91. I
14
     checked it myself. You know, the last time I had any
15
    reference to that particular passage was when Justice Kennedy
16
    was here himself many, many years ago, and he mentioned that
17
     case; he mentioned that -- he mentioned that principle -- and
18
     I think that's what it is -- and it really kind of touched
19
    home.
20
               MS. MORENO: Well, it's -- it was a racial issue.
21
               THE COURT: Oh, I know it was a racial issue.
22
               MS. MORENO: Very interesting.
23
               THE COURT: Yeah, it was a racial issue, but it was
    within the context of civil litigation.
24
25
               MS. MORENO: That's right.
```

```
THE COURT: Are we bringing these fellows out?
 1
 2
               DEPUTY U.S. MARSHAL: Are you ready?
 3
               THE COURT: Oh, sure, yeah. Counsel, juror number
 4
     70 on the list, Mr. Hoffmann, is a no-show.
 5
               THE CLERK:
                          Your Honor, it's number 71.
 6
               THE COURT: Oh, 71? Strike that. Juror 71, Cooper
 7
    is a no-show.
 8
               MS. FONTIER: So Hoffmann is here and Cooper is
 9
    not; is that correct?
               THE COURT: That's correct. Counsel, prospective
10
11
     juror number 21 was misspelled on the chart that I got.
     should be Cleavenger, not Cleaverger, okay? Okay.
12
13
          (The defendants entered the courtroom.)
          (Defendant A. Mohamud is being assisted by a Somali
14
15
    interpreter.)
16
               THE COURT: Very good. All defendants are present.
17
    Good morning, gentlemen. We are about ready to proceed by
18
    bringing our jurors in. And, Mr. Durkin, you wanted --
19
               MR. DURKIN: Judge, if I could -- Judge, if I could
20
     approach, I'd like to tender to you what I've marked Press
21
    number 1 with today's date on it. This is an article from
22
    this morning's New York Times regarding a suicide bomber that
23
    killed two people -- an al-Shabaab suicide bomber that killed
24
    two people at the Somali president's villa, and I would
25
    direct you to --
```

THE COURT: You would what?

MR. DURKIN: I was going to direct you to a particular sentence somewhere on here. I'm sorry, I didn't highlight it, but it mentions -- let's see -- one, two, three, four, five, the sixth paragraph down, it mentions that the attacker is believed to be an operative of the al-Qaeda-linked al-Shabaab insurgent group. I just wanted -- we wanted to bring this to your attention. I'm not -- certainly not suggesting that we ask the jury whether they heard about the suicide bombing, the al-Shabaab suicide bombing, but it is a concern that could keep raising its head, I assume, throughout the case. I guess maybe just some question about, you know, has anybody read any -- you know, I'd defer to the Court as to how to handle it.

THE COURT: Right. Well, you know, as in most high-profile cases or cases that are going to get a lot of attention from the media on an ongoing basis -- and we've certainly had those -- I think all you can do really is periodically admonish the jurors not to expose themselves to any news reporting of any type having anything to do with the case or any subject connected with the case. And as you know, now with what's been going on in Mali and then what more or less bled into Algeria, there's been more discussion in the news lately about insurgent groups and terrorist activities, and that's gaining some international prominence

at this point. True, it doesn't involve Somalia, but it's the kind of thing that I would and have already brought up with the potential jurors, that they are not to expose themselves to any newspaper articles or reporting of any kind related to any alleged terrorist activity. I'll certainly continue to do that. I'll key on what's happening in Africa; I mean I'll make general references to Africa, not just Somalia. I'm sure that there are some people in this group that are aware of what's going on and has been going on within the last few weeks and that event specifically in Mali and Algeria. So I think that's the best we can do.

It's been my experience that jurors are pretty good following that kind of an admonition. I appreciate you bringing this to my attention. I did note going through the questionnaires that we did have some New York Times readers, and of course this is picked up by the Associated Press --

MR. DURKIN: Right.

THE COURT: -- so it would be, I assume, reported in a number of different outlets. The other thing I was struck with -- and perhaps you folks know a little bit more about this than I do -- but I was surprised to hear that our State Department has recognized Somalia within the last week or two.

MR. DURKIN: Yes.

THE COURT: So that's certainly a positive

development. I doubt that more than one or two people in this group of prospective jurors would be aware of that or the significance of that. I mean we're all attuned to it, but I think generally the general population is not familiar with those kinds of issues.

I was also happy to see that at least one of our prospective jurors indicated on the sheet that she didn't know where the horn of Africa was, she didn't have a clue as to where the horn of Africa was. I suppose if you were to have given this group a geography test, there probably wouldn't be more than a few who could identify, without looking at a map, where the horn of Africa is.

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Durkin. We'll go ahead and bring our jurors up. I think we're ready to go. I think we have everybody here. Gaby, are you going to take role when they get here as to --

THE CLERK: They've taken role in Courtroom 15.

THE COURT: Hopefully we won't lose -- all right.

The latest is Ms. Cooper did show, so -- she's number 71, so we have all of the individuals now who were instructed to return today. Okay. I think what we can do is we'll seat them in the back, and then when they come in, we'll direct them into their seats.

Counsel, please note that when these panel members are taking their seats, 1 through 6 -- now we're just dealing

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in sequential order, not the randomized order -- but the first six jurors who are with us will take seats 1 through 6 in the top row; prospective juror number 7 will be in the first seat closest to the front of the courtroom here, bottom row; and then 7 through 12; then the two end seats, top and bottom, will be the alternate positions. Well, I'm just -for your reference, those individuals will be -- you configured this as it is in our courtroom, didn't you? Yeah. Okay. So seat 13 is the last seat in the top row; seat 14 is the last seat in the bottom row. Then we will start with the two extra seats against the wall on that side of the courtroom; they'll be 15 and 16. And then Mr. Buckner will be in seat 17, which will be the first seat in front of the bar there facing the front of the courtroom. And then we'll proceed all the way across with seat 36 presently occupied by a gentleman, and I think that's it. That's the order, okay? Okay. Let's get our jurors.

THE CLERK: They're on their way up.

(There was a break in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Good morning again, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for your promptness. I know you've already been assembling in Courtroom 15, which is actually right next to my courtroom, which is Courtroom 16 on the fifth floor, and so you got a little bit of a preview I think of what the courtroom will look like in which we're going to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

try this case. And so I thank you for your promptness this morning.

Let me again tell you what we're going to be doing today. In just a moment or two, I'm going to ask that 36 of you take assigned seats in the jury box and in the front row in front of the bar in the back of the courtroom, and at that point I'm going to ask some general questions of the first 36 of you.

Now, even though I won't be directing my questions to others -- and there will be approximately, oh, a dozen or so of you remaining in the back of the courtroom -- I would ask that all of the panel members who remain in the back of the courtroom behind the bar please listen very carefully to everything we're doing today, all the questions that are asked and the answers that are given. I will be starting this process, counsel are privileged to participate in it as well, but we want to -- we want to make sure that all of you remaining panel members are tracking with us so that if you are asked to take a seat amongst the first 36 panel members, that is, to join this 36-pack, or the group we're initially working with, that we can hit the ground running with you, that you will have been listening to everything that was said in the courtroom, and if there were any questions or answers or other comments made that caused you any concern or you feel we need to know, then obviously it would be your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

obligation to let us know about that concern. So we appreciate you keeping close attention to the proceedings as we proceed. Okay. That's pretty much it.

We'll take a midmorning break, about 15 minutes; sometime between 10:30 and eleven o'clock, we'll break for about 15 then, then we'll resume and then go the balance of the morning. We may go into the noon hour if doing so would allow us to break at a convenient time, and then we'll break for lunch after that, after our morning session, and we'll take something on the order of an hour to maybe an hour and 15 minutes for our break in the middle of the day, our noon recess, and then pick up about 1:30 -- I'll give you the precise time a little bit later today -- and then we'll go into the afternoon continuing on with the process of jury selection. And ultimately today is our plan to actually have our jurors identified, the 12 regular jurors and three alternates jurors. So that is the plan. Ultimately we would start the case tomorrow with opening statements and then proceed with the evidence thereafter.

We all very much appreciate the time you took in filling out these questionnaires. They help us immensely in focusing our follow-up questions with you, and they really do shorten the process for today. I think it's likely that one or more questions will be directed to each of you. There may be a few of you who are not asked any questions; if that be

the case for anyone, please do not feel as though you're being ignored or disrespected in any way. It's just that there were no questions that needed to be directed to you.

So I think that's -- I think that's pretty much it.

I think the next in order of business, ladies and gentlemen,
is to call you and to have you take your assigned seats, your
designated seats, the first 36 of you. This has been a
randomized list, by the way; we proceed with a randomized
list when we're calling each of you to take these seats. So

Mr. Bilse or Bilse -- how do you pronounce your name, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Bilse.

THE COURT: Mr. Bilse, if you'd come forward, please, and take the first seat in the top row closest to the front of the courtroom. Ms. Farkas, yes, if you'd come forward, please -- you're the next prospective juror -- and take your seat next to Mr. Bilse. Mr. Wease next. Ms. Lee will be taking seat number 4. Ms. Young and Mr. Channell, if you'd come forward, please. Okay. We have seats 1 through 6 occupied now.

Ms. Faith, if you'd please come forward and start the bottom row here, the seat closest to the front of the courtroom. Thank you. Ms. Flores, if you'd come forward and take the seat next to Ms. Faith. Mr. Sciacqua -- I hope that's a correct pronunciation. It is? All right, sir. If you'd come forward, take the ninth seat there. Mr. Johnson

would be next. Ms. Meza, next. Ms. Lopez would be taking the 12th seat, Ms. Meza first and then Ms. Lopez. Thank you.

And then Ms. Smith, if you would please come forward. Ms. Smith, I'd like you to take the seat in the top row there, the vacant seat in the top row in the jury box.

And then Ms. Salinas, please, the bottom row, vacant seat in the bottom row. Thank you. Mr. Tyndall. Mr. Tyndall, may I ask you to take -- there are two seats against the wall here in front of the bar. Take the one closest to the jury box, please. And Mr. Breier, if you would come forward and take the seat just next to Mr. Tyndall.

Mr. Buckner, would you please take the first seat facing the front of the courtroom right against the wall there. Ms. Murguia -- I'm sorry, Gustavo Murguia. I do apologize. You know, I'll tell you why. I think I owe you an explanation. One of my colleagues on the Ninth Circuit is named Mary Murguia, and -- she's not even from California, but I just associate the name Murguia with Mary Murguia and her twin sister. And I'm sure that's a very inadequate explanation that you're not going to appreciate, but it's the best I can do under these circumstances.

Ms. Free, if you would come forward, please. Mr.
Bristow next. Ms. Cleavenger. Ms. Freni. Mr. Roubidoux.
Ms. Delaney. Ms. Hernandez. Ms. Ramirez. Ms. Fierro. Ms.
Fierro, may I ask you to take the first seat across the aisle

```
there. That's it right there. Thank you. Ms. Stahl. Mr.
 1
 2
     Crowell. Mr. Brenzel. Mr. Dominguez. Mr. Merkin.
 3
    Mr. Evans. Mr. Mapanao.
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: May I talk to you a minute,
 5
    Judge?
 6
               THE COURT: Well, Mr. Mapanao, I'm going to ask
 7
    that you take your seat for now, and then we'll have a
 8
     chance.
             Thank you, sir. Mr. Adams. And Ms. Clark. Okay.
 9
    Mr. Mapanao, you need to see me; is that true?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, your Honor.
               THE COURT: Hold on just right where you are,
11
12
     please. Counsel, would you please come forward.
13
          (Following is a sidebar conference.)
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sorry, I should have told you
     this yesterday. I had my -- I have a medical issue. My wife
15
16
     gets a kidney transplant and is legally blind and --
17
               THE COURT: Would you like me to read this?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I have all kind of
19
    appointment.
20
               THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. Let me just take a
21
     look at this. Are you saying --
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And the other one is the
23
    nephrologist.
               THE COURT: Nephrology?
24
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Nephrology, getting a kidney
```

```
transplant.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Is she scheduled for it?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   2001.
 4
               THE COURT: Oh, she already had it. Is she having
 5
     trouble?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, just the eyes. She become
    blind, become blind, and that's where the -- where the
 7
 8
    medical issue is.
               THE COURT: Apparently she has an impaired visual
 9
     field. Does she have glaucoma? Does she --
10
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. No, it's not. It's -- it
    has something to do with the medicine, the CHAMPUS medicine.
12
13
               THE COURT: Are you her caregiver?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I am the only one in the
15
    house.
16
               THE COURT: Do you work as well?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm retired.
18
               THE COURT: You're retired, so you're --
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I should have said that when I
19
20
     turn in my paper. I'm 70 years old and I'm diabetic.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to excuse you,
2.2
    Mr. Mapanao and thank you for bringing this to our --
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I sure appreciate that.
24
               THE COURT: -- to our attention. And I wish you
25
    and your wife the best. And we'll call somebody else to --
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She should be -- she just
 1
 2
     didn't like it when I came home yesterday and I told her I
 3
    wish could get away with it; I like to stay.
 4
               THE COURT: You want to get out of the house for a
 5
     little while?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure. Thanks a lot.
 7
               THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you. All right.
 8
               MR. DRATEL: Are you going to consolidate the
 9
    people in the back so they can --
               THE COURT: It doesn't make any difference.
10
11
              MR. DRATEL: Well, it does to us in the sense --
    not going to know who they are, it's very difficult to
12
     determine the strikes if they don't get -- you know, when you
13
14
     get --
15
               THE COURT: I don't understand what you're saying
16
    here.
17
               MR. DRATEL: In other words, if they answer
18
    questions --
19
               THE COURT: No, no, they're not -- I'm not
20
    having -- they're not going to respond at all at this point.
21
     The only time they'll say anything is if they're called into
22
    the box. If I'm asking a general question, it's only of the
23
    first 36.
24
               MR. DRATEL: If they're called into the box, they
25
     can be number 36 or they can be --
```

```
THE COURT: Well, it depends who they're
 1
 2
    substituting for. Okay.
 3
               MR. DRATEL: Okay. That makes a big difference in
 4
     terms of our ability to then voir dire when they come in the
 5
    box.
 6
               THE COURT: No, not really. Why does it --
 7
               MR. DRATEL: Because if they're juror number 1,
 8
     then we have to know whether to exercise a strike or not. If
     they come in at the end and the process is over, we have not
 9
    voir dired them at all and don't know --
10
11
               THE COURT: You'll have an opportunity -- you'll
12
    have an opportunity to voir dire them at some point. It's
13
    not as --
14
               MR. DRATEL: Okay.
15
               THE COURT: How else could you exercise your
16
     strikes if you didn't --
17
               MS. MORENO: Exactly.
18
               THE COURT: Trust me. Trust me.
19
               MR. DRATEL: Okay.
20
               MS. MORENO: Thank you, your Honor.
21
          (Sidebar conference concludes.)
               THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Mapanao, ladies and
22
23
     gentlemen, has been excused for a significant and justifiable
24
    reason, and so we're going to call the next individual on the
25
     randomized list to substitute for Mr. Mapanao.
```

THE CLERK: Ms. Alise.

THE COURT: Ms. Alise, if would you would please take the seat vacated by Mr. Mapanao. Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, once again, I'm going to proceed at this point by asking general questions only of the first 36 of you who have taken your assigned seats, what we call -- what I refer to as a 36-pack.

Now, these questions are not directed to any of the remaining members of the jury panel, as I've already explained, but as I've already explained, please listen very carefully to what we're doing because if your name is called to substitute for someone, just as what happened with Mr.

Mapanao, then we need to make sure that you've been tracking with us and you know what our questions have reference to, you know what the areas of concern are. And so we'll proceed at this point. Once again, questions just directed to the first 36 of you in your assigned seats.

I'm going to start off with that question I asked two or three times yesterday. It's really the most significant question I can ask you, ladies and gentlemen. Each side is entitled to have a fair and unbiased jury in this case, and if for any reason you now think that you cannot be a fair and unbiased juror in this matter, I would like you to raise your hand. I see no hands raised in the jury box, I see no hands raised on either side of the

courtroom in the front row. Okay. Very well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, going through the -- going through the questionnaires and looking at the individual responses was certainly informative, and it obviously and predictably is the case that many of you have had some contact with the government, the United States government, in the past or perhaps even presently through the military or through employment. I'll be asking these questions individually of you or of most of you as I address you individually, but if there is anyone here who because of their association or connection with the United States government, past or present, either in a military context or a civilian employment context or for any other reason who feels that he or she is leaning to one side or the other, specifically would favor the government in this case because of that affiliation, because of that connection, would you please raise your hand if anyone feels that. Anyone in the jury box? I see no hands raised. And in the back of the courtroom? When I say the back of the courtroom, I'm meaning for those of you seated in your assigned seats in front of the bar here. I see no hands raised.

And we'll be proceeding this way, ladies and gentlemen. In effect, if you do not give me an affirmative response by raising your hand, each and every one of you is communicating individually to me that your response is

negative, and so it allows us to proceed much more expeditiously.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That opens up another more general question, which is this: If any of you have ever had a particularly positive experience with the United States government or any agency of the United States government or such a negative experience with the government or any agency of the government such that you could be influenced by that in this case, would you please raise your hand. I've already mentioned the employment context, the military context. Perhaps you've had a bit of a run-in with the IRS at some point in the past, you've been unfairly audited; you've been stopped at a border patrol checkpoint and treated unreasonably; or there have been -- there's been some immensely positive experience that you've had; anything either particularly positive or negative that could influence you in this case? If so, would you please raise your hand at the present time. Anyone in the jury box who would have an affirmative response either way on that? I see no hands. How about in the back of the courtroom for those of you in your assigned seats in front of the bar? I see no hands raised. Okay.

A subject I touched on yesterday, ladies and gentlemen, involved the credibility or believability of witnesses, and you are the judges of the credibility or believability of witnesses who testify in this case. I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

indicated to you that there were several standards or criteria by which you would be evaluating the credibility, believability, of witnesses' testimony; I listed them off for you in general terms: The manner in which a witness testifies, the character and quality of that testimony, the demeanor, the attitude of the witness while testifying, any prior inconsistent statements that might have been made by a witness that comes into evidence, any prior consistent statements that might have come in to evidence, and, you know, anything that bears upon the reasonableness, the credibility of witnesses beyond that is certainly something you could take into account. I also mentioned to you that this -- this list of factors, these criteria, apply to all witnesses, all witnesses, whether someone's affiliated with one side or the other or not, whether someone's in law enforcement or not, whether someone's an expert witness or not; you apply the same standards. You may weigh them differently ultimately, but you apply the same standards. Now, focusing on the law enforcement part of this,

Now, focusing on the law enforcement part of this, as I was going, you know, through the questionnaires and based on prior experience having dealt with literally many hundreds of juries over the past, it is the case that some people feel that a law enforcement officer's testimony is entitled to greater weight than the testimony of nonlaw enforcement officers or nongovernmental witnesses simply

because of their position in law enforcement or affiliated with a particular governmental agency, and I think there were a few people -- I think there were a few people who indicated on their questionnaire responses that they might fall into that category, that they would be giving a law enforcement officer -- well, let's just get it down to this case, specifics to this case -- perhaps an FBI agent, the testimony of such a person greater weight simply because of that person's occupation.

If there is anyone here who feels that that is their position on this question -- hold on -- I'll get to you. I see you. If there's anyone here who feels that a law enforcement officer's testimony is more credible simply because of the fact that they're in law enforcement, would you please raise your hand. In the jury box? I see no hands raised. Okay. We did have -- we did have someone raise his hand. Sir, would you state your last name, please?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Roubidoux.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Roubidoux, I think I saw that on your questionnaire as well. That is your feeling apparently?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anyone else who feels as Mr. Roubidoux does, simply because someone is in law enforcement, they're more inherently truthful? I see no

other hands raised. Are you in law enforcement? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. I'm a state employee. 3 THE COURT: Sorry? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a state employee. I work 5 with the law enforcement on a daily --6 THE COURT: Are you the Caltrans worker. 7 Yes, sir. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 8 THE COURT: All right. So you're the Caltrans. 9 You know, you had an interesting response in your questionnaire; you indicated that you work with Caltrans, and 10 11 obviously we all know that law enforcement in the form of the California Highway Patrol will provide some support for 12 13 Caltrans as Caltrans workers are in the field sometimes; I'm 14 sure you appreciate that support. You indicated in your questionnaire that their instructions, their directives to 15 16 you have proven to be reliable. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct. 18 THE COURT: And which is certainly understandable because they're out there to offer protection and all. 19 20 a result of that experience and your working with the 21 California Highway Patrol that you feel law enforcement 2.2 officers generally are more truthful than nonlaw enforcement 23 officers? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Besides that I have good 25 friends that's a deputy sheriff here in San Diego.

THE COURT: Okay. And so you've not been in law enforcement yourself?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: But as you sit here right now, do you feel that as a group, law enforcement officers would be more likely to tell the truth than you or me or any of the attorneys --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- in this -- okay. Well, I'm not going to take any more time with you, Mr. Roubidoux. You've got a very, very firm position there. And, ladies and gentlemen, it just is the case -- and I'm glad to be able to use Mr. Roubidoux as an example -- it just is the case that we will from time to time encounter someone who has this feeling that elevates law enforcement to such a level that they think that when they take the stand and testify, that's it, that's gospel. And we can't start with that premise. As one of your number put it -- one of the best answers I've ever seen in connection with that question on the questionnaire, question 50 -- the answer of the individual was if that were the case, if law enforcement officers were more truthful than other people, then why would we need juries? And I thought about that, and I thought it was an enlightened response.

Mr. Roubidoux, I really do thank you for your

candor. And you do -- you do important and dangerous work 1 2 out there and stay safe. I'm going to excuse you for cause 3 and thank you for your time and service. 4 THE CLERK: Mr. Michael Todd. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Todd, if you'd come forward and 6 take the seat just vacated by Mr. Roubidoux there, we would 7 appreciate it. Mr. Todd, you've heard what I've had to say thus far? 8 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 10 THE COURT: Can you be a fair and impartial juror 11 if selected in this case? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. I've got as far as the question 13 14 relating to credibility of witnesses and law enforcement 15 officers. Would you use the same standards for all witnesses 16 regardless of whether they're law enforcement or not? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I would. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Tyndall? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Far as I know. 20 THE COURT: I'm going to get that microphone over 21 there to you so everyone can hear you. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: As far as I remember, my 23 response was "not always," but now I'm trying to think what I 24 meant. 25

THE COURT: Yeah, I was trying to figure that out

```
as well.
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: When I say there's no
 3
     credibility, can you say it one more time so I --
 4
               THE COURT: Believability.
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Believability. In terms in
 6
     terms of a law enforcement issue --
 7
               THE COURT: No, no. What I'm --
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   I got confused.
 9
               THE COURT: Let me try explain. There will be
10
    witnesses called to testify in this case.
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
12
               THE COURT: Some of them will be affiliated with
13
     law enforcement --
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Okay.
15
               THE COURT: -- federal law enforcement --
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Okay.
17
               THE COURT: -- such as one or more FBI agents. And
18
    there may be other people as well who are affiliated with one
     law enforcement agency or another. If a law enforcement
19
20
     officer takes the stand and begins to testify on a contested
21
     issue, something that's in dispute ultimately where the
2.2
    evidence is disputed --
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In relationship to the
24
    enforcement of the issue.
25
               THE COURT: Does it relate to enforcement of the
```

issue?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's the law enforcement officer's or duty. In other words -- I guess that's where I got confused. If he was questioned about the enforcement policy or issue that he was involved with, he's trained more highly than a person that isn't --

THE COURT: Well, no, no. You raise a very -- you raise a very valid point. You raise a very valid point. Because one of the criteria for assessing the believability of a witness, whether that witness is a law enforcement officer, whether that witness is an expert perhaps in law enforcement or in some other area not involving law enforcement, is the ability of the witness to see or hear or know the things testified to. So, for example, taking it to a case having nothing to do with the facts of this case, if you have a law enforcement officer, a traffic officer, who's trained to investigate traffic accidents, and this case isn't a criminal case, it's a civil case involving an automobile accident and a claim for damages, and you have an officer take the stand who was responsible for investigating the accident, and that officer has made certain conclusions regarding the accident, and those conclusions are disputed by the testimony of someone who does not have the training of a law enforcement officer, a traffic investigator --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mean a person on the street

that observed it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Exactly. Then that's a case where as you're being instructed on the credibility of witnesses, including the factor you're to take into account the ability of that officer to see or hear or know the things testified to, i.e., training, and that officer's also an expert witness with specialized training and you're instructed that you can take into account that witness's testimony regarding the experience and the training that the individual has received, then what you're going to do is you're going to weigh those particular criteria against -- or for each of those two witnesses, the law enforcement officer and the pedestrian standing on the street, and those are going to be plus factors for the investigating officer. You may still disagree with the conclusions of the investigating officer, but at least you're taking that training, that experience, the ability to see or hear or know into account in an appropriate way. Do you understand what I'm saying? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, but that particular case was put in front of us, at that point in time we can make a decision who's more credible.

sion who's more credible.

THE COURT: Absolutely. That's your job.

THE COURT: ADSOLUTELY. That's your job.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.

THE COURT: So my question is to you, Mr. Tyndall, and to all the other prospective jurors here, if you're

approaching this case with the mindset that people in law enforcement are just more inherently truthful than people who are not in law enforcement -
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe my response was "not

always."

THE COURT: Your response was "not always." But my question to you is do you believe that; do you believe that people in law enforcement are more truthful than people who are not in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, if you put it that way, I would have -- I would have to say no, taking it from a human nature standpoint. In other words, you know, a credible witness may tend to twist it, a credible law enforcement officer may have not observed or may not remembered what he saw and went ahead and said something anyway. I guess on behalf of that, I would have to say no.

THE COURT: You're really struggling with it, aren't you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I --

THE COURT: I know it's hard for you to get to that point of neutrality, isn't it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's why I wanted to -- why I put "not always" because I was a little confused about -- and that's what I was leaving in the area of no, not all of them tell the truth.

THE COURT: You know, some of these questions in the questionnaire, you know, they're very, very broadly based questions and they're not intended to elicit finely spun -- a finely spun analysis as to all possible scenarios that could arise. They're general questions, and if you give a general answer, you're giving a general answer but knowing that there would be so many variations on that answer depending upon the circumstances, and many of you answered that question in that vein. But, Mr. Tyndall, if you're really straining, if you've elevated law enforcement to a point where --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I have not, no.

THE COURT: Let me finish what I was going to say.

-- where it's going to be difficult for you to look at a law enforcement officer and not give that testimony extra weight simply because of that person's position, that person's status as law enforcement, then we need to know that. If you can look at the law enforcement officer as any other witness, just as truthful or nontruthful as any other witness potentially, and judge the believability of the -- of the testimony on the factors that you'll be instructed about, then that's fine, then you can remain with us here. But I can't spend too much more time on this. We're spending a lot of time on this issue just with you, so you search your own thought process or heart or let us know right now if you feel that you can abide by that or you just feel that for whatever

reason, you're struggling with this -- with this principle.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I would at this point in time accept the requirement, whatever, that I have to be equal of those of that situation. I wasn't sure if I had to be. I thought an expert witness -- I never been on a jury, so I really don't know -- an expert witness versus the guy on the street. I mean am I being biased towards the expert witness or the guy on the street? I guess if you had asked me that way, yeah, I would probably, you know, say it again. But there again, it would depend on the evidence on both sides, and then I can evaluate it.

THE COURT: Is there anyone else here who's struggling with this issue as Mr. Tyndall is? If so, would you raise your hand. This is something we just have to, you know, discuss and then move on. Typically, ladies and gentlemen, I present the question as I presented it. I usually do it in two parts: Is there anyone here who feels law enforcement officers are inherently more believable than other people, than the rest of us, and the vast majority of people say no, and they can fairly judge the ability of a law enforcement officer to testify as other people would. There are people, however, encountered from time to time who feel that law enforcement officers, that's it, they're more truthful than the rest of us, and I'm going to give their testimony extra weight regardless of what it might be.

Sometimes that comes because of a connection between that person and law enforcement; usually that person has been in law enforcement or is the spouse of someone in law enforcement, they've been around law enforcement, and it's difficult for them to treat law enforcement officers as they would anyone else. That's just the first side of it.

The other side I typically ask is is there anyone here who feels that law enforcement officers are less truthful than other people because of perhaps a bad experience they've had with law enforcement, and you can plug in any number of scenarios there, and every once in a while, somebody will raise a hand and say that's me, I was falsely arrested and, you know, or somebody, I was subject to a circumstance where a law enforcement officer was less than truthful, and I can't get that out of my mind. Okay. Thank you for your candor, you're not — this is not a case that you should be sitting on. So that's the second part of what I typically explore with prospective jurors.

Mr. Tyndall, I'm going to excuse you because I don't want you to struggle with this one. It seems as though you are. I get the impression that it's going to be difficult for you to follow the Court's instructions on this particular issue. I thank you for your time and service. I'm going to ask that you return to the jury lounge at this time.

if selected?

We will call Ms. Boggess or Boggess. If you'd come forward, please, Ms. Boggess. Thank you. Okay. Ms.

Boggess, you've heard all of my instructions and the questions I've asked so far?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I have heard them.

THE COURT: Can you be a fair and impartial juror

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I believe I can be a fair and impartial juror.

THE COURT: Okay. You've seen us spend a lot of time on this issue involving credibility of law enforcement officers. Would you be able to judge the credibility, believability, of a law enforcement officer's testimony as you would for any other witness?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I believe I would be able to do that.

then and -- with the rest of the prospective jurors seated in their assigned seats. If there is anyone here who feels that -- that law enforcement officers, including federal law enforcement officers, people associated with the FBI and other such agencies, are inherently more truthful or less truthful than others who are not in law enforcement, would you please raise your hand at the present time. Anyone in the jury box feel that way, please let me see your hand. And

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I see no hands. Anyone in the front row of the bar on my right side? I see no hands. On the left side I see no hands. All right. Very good. We'll move away from this subject, but if anyone feels upon further reflection that this particular area may be a problem, then please let me know. Okay.

I wanted to raise an issue that I'll be raising from time to time, I touched upon it yesterday, and it involves media accounts, news accounts of this case, although I think that won't be an issue in the case; there may be an article or two during the course of the trial. Obviously you've been instructed that you must not expose yourself to any such article or information, extraneous information. I've also requested that you isolate yourselves from all media reporting, news reporting of any kind having anything to do with the political situation in any of the African countries. I know that we've seen or been made aware of certain events happening in Mali and Algeria and a few other north African countries. Somalia may be in the news from time to time. It's very important that we not expose ourselves to any reporting on any of these issues having to do with political upheaval or action taking place, activities taking place in any of the African countries; I'll just take it to that entire continent. You see a newspaper when -you're flipping through the newspaper and you begin to see a

headline that may have something to do with this case, don't read it. Set it aside if you want to see it later after the case is over. If you're watching television or you're -- you click on an Internet story having something to do with a subject that is even remotely connected to this case, turn the channel or don't click on the link or whatever it happens to be.

If there is anyone here who feels that he or she would not be able to follow that instruction, would you please raise your hand at the present time. I see no hands raised.

I would -- I would rely on each and every juror in this case that if something did come to their attention inadvertently -- if, for example, they were reading an account of an issue, an event, a situation and you got partway into it, I would rely on you to, as I say, set it aside. But if in fact something came to your attention inadvertently that you simply did not have any opportunity to ignore, I would ask that you advise -- you advise me if you're a juror on this case so that at least I could address it with counsel and we could make sure that it would have no effect on you sitting -- continuing to sit as a fair and impartial juror. Okay.

I want to bring up another general principle, sympathy, prejudice, public opinion, possible punishment;

```
those are things that you may not consider in determining
 1
 2
    whether the defendants, or any of the defendants, are guilty
 3
    or not quilty of the charges in this case. Sympathy,
 4
    prejudice, public opinion, possible punishment. Set them
 5
    aside. Do not be influenced by them in any way.
 6
               If there is anyone here who feels that he or she
 7
    could be influenced, would consider sympathy, prejudice,
 8
    public opinion, and possible punishment, would you please
    raise your hand at this time. I see no hands raised. Okay.
 9
               What I'd like to do is turn to the questionnaires
10
11
    at this point. I'll have a few other general questions for
12
     you as we go through this process, ladies and gentlemen, and
13
     I'll reserve those for a little bit until I can get a little
14
    bit more of an appreciation for each of you and how you might
15
    have responded on these questionnaires, so it's about time we
16
    started this process.
17
               Mr. Bilse, let me -- Bilse let's start with you,
18
          We'll get that microphone to you. All right, Mr.
19
    Bilse. Sir, how long have you been a traffic engineer for
20
     the City of Carlsbad?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Five years.
22
               THE COURT: Okay. Do you supervise any people
23
     there?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes, sir.
```

THE COURT: Approximately how many?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Three. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. Have you been in traffic 3 engineering and traffic planning basically your whole life, 4 so to speak, except for the time you were in aerospace? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: Okay. And your spouse or significant 7 other is an urban planner, and just a little more information 8 about that, sir. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She does environmental impact 10 reports for land development. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. You indicated that 12 you had a -- you were a victim of crime at some point in the 13 past, and someone was apprehended in connection with that 14 matter. You came into contact I assume with law enforcement 15 individuals in connection with that case at some point? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Was that -- was that contact a positive 18 contact for you? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was neutral I guess. It was 20 very quick. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that contact with 22 law enforcement that would incline you to favor one side or 23 the other in this case? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 25 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. If you could pass

the microphone to Ms. Farkas. Ms. Farkas, I was looking at 1 2 that part of the questionnaire which relates to your views of 3 the Muslim or Islamic faith, and I had the impression that 4 your primary concern was what some people at a very early age 5 may be taught in some particular schools. Does that -- does 6 that color your thinking generally about the entire Muslim or 7 Islamic faith? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, your Honor. THE COURT: What did you have reference to? Were 9 10 you talking about schools where -- where kids are instructed 11 in Wahhabism or --12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Certain facets in the Muslim 13 faith, they do instruct children that --14 THE COURT: Well, you're generalizing once again 15 that --16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm generalizing. 17 THE COURT: Yeah, there may be a particular 18 group --19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. 20 THE COURT: That will instruct kids in a 21 particular -- but do you extend that to the entire faith? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, of course not. I think 23 generally Muslims are good people, but I am very fearful that 24 a certain facet of them can be trained that way and that they 25 believe that Americans are bad, and that's my fear about

1 | that.

2.2

THE COURT: Okay. And you feel that the answers you gave that -- at least to the extent that you were critical -- were answers that were reserved just for that relatively small --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.

THE COURT: -- percentage or small group --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.

THE COURT: -- that teach things that you're not -- that you have difficulty with?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. You seem to have substantial contacts with Muslims; in going through the questionnaire, you've had contact in organizations and you socialize with them as well. Is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. And is there any particular reason that you've come into contact with Muslims in different contexts?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, San Diego is a very versatile area and has a lot of different people, and as far as, you know, my dry cleaner, taxi drivers, people just generally. And I like different people, I like cultural people, and I like to communicate with them, and I like to find out where they're -- what they're about and what their,

you know, their families are about, and I like to talk to 1 2 them. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And I find them interesting, 5 and so that's why I get to know them. And I've traveled 6 quite a bit, so --7 THE COURT: Do you have any doubt as to your ability to be completely fair in this case? 8 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not at all. 10 THE COURT: You indicated that you think that in 11 connection with the United States's response to terrorism 12 that -- that the United States is being far too fair; what do 13 you mean by that? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I think we need to be a 15 little tougher. I think that they -- they let a lot of 16 people get away with a lot of things. 17 THE COURT: Who is they? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The government, yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: The government? And what do you --20 flesh that out for me a little bit in terms of --21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, of course I'm not in a 2.2 position to do that because I'm not in a position to be 23 anyone that's going to take care of anything that way, but I 24 think a lot of Americans feel that we need to be a little

stronger in our positions. That's just a personal opinion.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Stronger in what types of positions? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, maybe in immigration, maybe in not giving in to any demands, just being a little tougher all the way around. THE COURT: So politically you're talking about conservative positions --PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: -- such as immigration and others? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: And when you say we're being far too fair, I still -- most people would say that that's a good thing, being as fair as you possibly can; but you seem to feel that we're just being, what, too docile or too tolerant of certain things or --PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. THE COURT: Yes? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. THE COURT: You have to answer audibly yes or no. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: But would any of those feelings, any of those feelings you might have with respect to political issues of the day in any way affect your thinking in a case such as this? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: Are you clear about that?

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. You feel, once again, even though we've been talking about these things and you -- politically you're -- you have some criticism of the government, that none of that criticism, none of those feelings would in any way impair you in this case.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you, Ms.

Farkas. Mr. Wease?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Good morning to you, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.

THE COURT: Once again, on your responses to this one particular area, you seem to be neutral on the Muslim or Islamic faith, but, once again, you have strong feelings about radicalists and extremists. And so the question I would ask you would be the same question I had for Ms. Farkas: Whatever your views on radical elements of Islam, could you fairly judge the evidence in this case? The charges in this case are very discrete charges; the charges are that these gentlemen, and each of them, provided material support to terrorists, a foreign terrorist organization, and/or conspired to do so. The organization is al-Shabaab, as I mentioned yesterday. The fact that al-Shabaab is a foreign terrorist organization and certified as such is not

even in dispute in this case. The question is whether or not 1 2 the government can prove that material support by the 3 defendants were provided to this organization. That gets us 4 away from concerns I think Ms. Farkas had, concerns you may have about what is taught in some small percentage of schools 5 6 and what some radical extremists actually do. Can you 7 separate the two in your mind? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I'm sure I can. 9 THE COURT: Okay. No doubts about that? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THE COURT: On prior jury service, you indicated 11 12 that you were frustrated because during deliberations some jurors in your mind didn't follow the instructions of the 13 14 Court and no verdict was reached as a result. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct. 16 THE COURT: That can be frustrating. That can be 17 frustrating. My question for you is this: Because you had a 18 frustrating experience in another case and because that jury 19 was not able to reach a verdict in that case, would you rush 20 to judgment in this case just to reach a verdict --21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 22 THE COURT: -- and to avoid the jury not being able 23 to reach a decision?

25 THE COURT: You'd take as much time as it

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

```
reasonably took to reach a verdict if you're a member of this
 1
     jury.
 2
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I would.
 4
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Wease.
 5
    Ms. Lee?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
               THE COURT: Good morning.
 7
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
 9
               THE COURT: Ms. Lee, I don't think I have any
10
     questions for you. Are you terribly disappointed?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I had one addition.
12
               THE COURT: Please.
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was resting last night --
               THE COURT: Could you speak up a little? Why don't
14
15
    we get the microphone over to you.
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: One addition. We're talking
17
    about organizations in the questionnaire. Can I address
     that?
18
19
               THE COURT: Yes. You've got California Teachers
20
    Association.
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
2.2
               THE COURT: California Teachers?
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Within my job as a
24
    teacher we do fundraising, and we were doing a coin drive and
25
     a gala fundraising, and it was for a country in Africa,
```

```
Growing Liberia's Children.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Okay.
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's the only thing that I
 4
    had thought of as an organization that I had --
 5
               THE COURT:
                          Do you recall what country?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Liberia.
 7
               THE COURT: I'm sorry.
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Liberia, Africa.
 9
               THE COURT: Okay. When's the last time you did
10
    teach, Ms. Lee?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Six months ago.
12
               THE COURT: And what courses, what level and
13
     courses?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I taught kindergarten for ten
15
     years.
16
               THE COURT: And are you between jobs right now?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am between jobs.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Lee.
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Thank you.
20
               THE COURT: And Ms. Young, good morning.
2.1
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, sir.
2.2
               THE COURT: What did you do for Sav-On Drugs before
23
    you retired?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was a district cosmetic
25
     coordinator. I oversaw 25 stores, the cosmetic departments.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay. Did you have people assisting
 1
 2
    you or did you supervise others in that regard?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did.
 4
               THE COURT: How many did you supervise?
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, 25.
 6
               THE COURT: Twenty-five people? Okay. And for how
 7
    long did you work in that capacity?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About ten years --
 9
               THE COURT: Okay.
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- maybe that.
               THE COURT: All right. Your spouse is a field
11
12
    mechanic, and he's still working?
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, he's retired also.
14
               THE COURT: Retired as well? And what kind of work
15
    did he do? I mean working for what kind of a --
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: SDG&E.
              THE COURT: SDG&E. Okay.
17
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All the trucks and --
19
               THE COURT: All right. Very good. Thank you,
20
    Ms. Young. Mr. Channell?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, sir.
21
22
               THE COURT: Good morning. You're currently DOD; is
23
    that correct?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
25
               THE COURT: Okay. And where are you working
```

specifically? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: NLF, Imperial Beach. 3 THE COURT: How long have you been with the 4 Department of Defense? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Twelve years. 6 THE COURT: And so the question that I asked 7 previously about identifying with the government would 8 certainly pertain to you. Do you feel as a result of being employed by the government, working generally in the area of 9 10 defense that you would be inclined to favor the government in 11 this case? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I also spent ten years in 13 the military too, so I've seen a lot of stuff, and there's 14 extremists on both ends. So I'm pretty fair as it is. I've 15 seen a lot, so --16 THE COURT: Okay. Setting aside what you've seen, 17 would your employment with the government in and of itself or 18 your past military experience just incline you to favor the 19 government? Do you feel some kind of an affinity for the 20 government because you work for the government at this time 21 and you have this military background? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 23 THE COURT: Okay. When you say you've seen a lot, 24 what are you referring to? 25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I've had a couple of

```
deployments; I've been to the Persian Gulf a couple of times,
 1
 2
     I was actually deployed to Jordan, actually been to Somalia.
 3
     There's a lot of good people out there, and sometimes they
 4
    just kind of get overtaken by bad people.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay. Any of those experiences, any of
 6
     that exposure in any area that could influence you in this
 7
     case?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, your Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: If you're on this jury, could you
10
    resist the temptation of talking about that experience if
     you're deliberating with the jury and all of a sudden
11
12
    somebody asks you well --
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
14
               THE COURT: -- I remember you were in Somalia, you
15
    were in Jordan, you've had contact with Muslims; what
16
    happened there? Would you be able to say wait a minute, you
17
     know, the Court told us we can't --
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
19
               THE COURT: -- that's extraneous information, I
20
     can't bring that into deliberations?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I could.
22
               THE COURT: All right. And you feel you can be
23
     completely fair in this case?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
25
               THE COURT: All right.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's one thing I've always 1 2 believed in is being fair. 3 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Channell. Thank you, 4 If you'd pass the microphone down to Ms. Faith, we'll 5 hear from her. Could you give us a little bit more 6 information, Ms. Faith -- good morning to you. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 8 THE COURT: -- what you did as a resource developer 9 for Urban Corps of San Diego. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, Urban Corps works with 10 underprivileged and at-risk students between 18 and 25 who've 11 dropped out of high school, and a number of our students were 12 13 either from Iraq, we had a few from Somalia, and my job there 14 was to help them find employment primarily. 15 THE COURT: These are young people for the most 16 part? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 17 18 THE COURT: You indicated in your questionnaire 19 that some of the people that you had worked with or had 20 contact with were Somalis. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 22 THE COURT: And these were Somali youth? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, under 25. 24 THE COURT: Approximately how many? 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not that many, maybe a handful,

five or six. 1 2 THE COURT: Did you personally interact? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 3 Yes. 4 THE COURT: And was that experience a positive 5 experience for you? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, it was. 7 THE COURT: Anything about that particular 8 experience that could in any way incline you to favor one side or the other in this case? 9 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think so, no. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Are you clear about that? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Okay. You know, as I was going through 14 your questionnaire last night, I came upon your response to 15 question 19, and if you don't mind, I'm going to read it 16 because I think this was a -- I think this was a wonderful 17 response. 18 The question was do you have an opinion whether Muslims are more violent than non-Muslims, and your answer 19 20 was "Tough question." That's how you started out. 21 press has certainly covered recent violence in Muslim 2.2 countries, but on an individual basis, I don't think they are 23 more violent." 24 So basically what you're saying is forget the

labels, forget the groups, people are people, yes, there's

coverage of what's happening with perhaps certain extremists 1 2 or radical groups or organizations, but people need to be 3 judged for who they are. Is that essentially what you --4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely. 5 THE COURT: -- as a subtext of your answer. 6 I certainly appreciate that answer, and I think -- I think 7 that will be it, Ms. Faith. I don't have any further 8 questions of you at this time. Thank you. Ms. Flores, I really don't have any questions of 9 10 you at this time. Anything you'd like to add? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. THE COURT: Anything that you've heard us discuss 12 this morning that causes you any concern or poses any 13 14 questions for you in any way? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Flores. 17 Sciacqua? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, your Honor. THE COURT: Good morning, sir. I know you're 19 20 retired, and after your military career you indicated you 21 were an educator in the San Diego community. Can you tell us 22 what you did in that regard. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For the city college I was 23 24 helping foreigners, immigrants, learn math and teaching them 25 English terms about math because it's very -- the English

```
language is a very confusing. And many of my students were
 1
 2
     from Somalia, which was good in the sense that I could
    practice, keep up my Italian with them because they,
 3
 4
    unfortunately, were under Mussolini for a few years or their
 5
    grandparents or parents were, and we also had a lot of
 6
    Vietnamese students and some --
 7
               THE COURT: So you were working with Somalis who
 8
    spoke Italian?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. And also some of the
10
    Vietnamese spoke French --
11
               THE COURT: I see.
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- the older, because it was
13
     French Indochina.
14
               THE COURT: Right. I would assume they were older.
15
    But how many Somali individuals did you have this kind of
16
     contact with?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, I really -- it's just a
18
     guess. We had a class about 30 students all together, and
    maybe -- sometimes there would be four or five individuals
19
20
    from Somalia in that class, and then the next year there may
21
    be none, so -- because it varied.
22
               THE COURT: Okay. And the contacts were
23
    instructive, were positive I'm assuming?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
25
               THE COURT: Any problems associated with any of
```

```
your relationships with anyone of Somali descent that could
 1
 2
    in any way be problematic for you?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   No.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. Do you have legal training,
 5
    training in the law?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I took legal courses -- I was a
 7
    line officer, and in the early -- in the '50s, I took classes
    because the JAG for the Navy had not been expanded, so as a
 8
     line officer I was required to do court work, and I was
 9
10
     defense counsel on a special courts marshal.
11
               THE COURT: I saw that, yes, you were -- on how
12
    many cases were you defense counsel?
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I was actually -- let's
14
     see. I was defense three or four times, and I was trial
15
     counsel, which is the prosecutor's side, once and on the
16
    board once, on the --
17
               THE COURT: Okay.
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- all for special courts.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Very good, sir.
20
     you feel you could set aside whatever past legal experience
21
     you've had in the Uniform Code of Military Justice and --
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, it's different because
23
     I've also worked at the superior court as a juror.
24
               THE COURT: As a what now?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In the jury across the street
```

```
at the superior courts.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: You worked at --
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was selected.
 3
 4
               THE COURT: Oh, you've had prior jury experience,
 5
     yeah. All right, sir. Thank you.
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
 7
               THE COURT: Mr. Johnson?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Good morning, your Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: Good morning. I assume that you are
10
    a -- you hold a supervisor position with --
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The Sharpell (phonetic) plant,
12
     sir.
13
               THE COURT: Yes.
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
15
               THE COURT: Okay. How many people are you
16
     supervising at the present time, sir?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: There's 18 people, sir.
18
               THE COURT: How long have you been working in that
19
    capacity?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Three years, sir.
21
               THE COURT: All right. And you're also a licensed
2.2
    minister at your church?
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. Do you believe that any of the
25
    teachings of the church or any of your religious studies or
```

philosophy could in any way influence you in this case, sir? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Could you repeat that again, 3 sir. 4 THE COURT: Yes. I'm basically asking you do you 5 feel that any of the teachings of the church or any of the 6 religious principles to which you adhere could in any way impose a burden on you in being fair and impartial in this 7 8 case? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. No, sir. No, your 10 Honor. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I realize you're not of the Muslim faith obviously; that is apparent here from your 12 13 questionnaire. You're indicating that you believe the Muslim 14 or Islamic faiths are free choice for anyone to practice, 15 everyone has a right to practice the faith they want. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Would you hold it against anyone, any 18 of these defendants, for not embracing the religious principles and teachings that you embrace as a minister? 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 21 THE COURT: Okay. I was interested with the law enforcement contacts that you've had in the past, 2.2 23 particularly -- well, it started pretty early, and I think

most of us, many of us can relate to that kind of an early

contact with law enforcement. And there was another

24

```
circumstance, not perhaps law-enforcement centered, but was
 1
 2
    pretty difficult for you as you relate that. Your younger
 3
    brother has -- that was in a spot of trouble; that's
 4
    reflected here. Any of your contact with law enforcement in
     the past that could in any way influence your thinking, your
 5
 6
    attitude in this case?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
               THE COURT: Do you think your brother-in-law was
 8
 9
    fairly treated by the criminal justice system?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
               THE COURT: All right. The family seemed to accept
11
12
     what occurred and --
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely, yes, sir.
14
               THE COURT: -- felt? Okay. All right. Thank you,
15
    Mr. Johnson. Ms. Meza?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Good morning. Ms. Meza, I don't think
18
     I need to follow up with you at this particular point in
19
     time; I don't have any questions for you. Anything that
20
     you've heard so far this morning that raises any concern for
21
     you? Anything that you'd like to volunteer that would be
22
    responsive to the areas of questioning thus far?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not so far.
23
24
               THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Meza. Thank you. Ms. Lopez,
25
    good morning.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 1 THE COURT: How was your -- how was your husband 2 3 employed. I'm sorry for your loss. How he was employed? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He was -- when I met him, he was in sales. 5 6 THE COURT: And --7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He was -- served in the DEA when he was in his 20s. I met him when he was 44. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. Did he ever talk to you about 10 his earlier employment in the DEA? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not really. 12 THE COURT: Do you know how long he had been in the 13 DEA? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think it was just about two 15 or three years after -- he'd come out of the Vietnam War and 16 then went into the DEA. 17 THE COURT: Okay. I want to compliment you. You 18 were the one that had responded to that question on 19 credibility of law enforcement officers. The question was 20 "Would you always believe a law enforcement officer over 21 other witnesses?" Your answer was, "If I did, jurors would 2.2 not be needed," one of the more novel responses I've seen to 23 that question over many years. Okay, Ms. Lopez. Thank you. 24 Ms. Smith is next, right behind you there. Thanks. 25 Ms. Smith, can I get a little bit more information from you

```
about your current occupation.
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work for an international
    society for computational --
 3
 4
               THE COURT: Is that microphone working? Why don't
 5
    you bump it a little bit and see --
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can talk loud.
 7
               THE COURT: That's kind of par for the course for
 8
     this microphone. You going to switch batteries, Gaby? You
 9
     should keep a couple in your pocket.
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
11
               THE COURT: Okay. So ISCB.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: International Society for
12
13
     Computational Biology, but all do I is the admin support for
14
    it.
15
               THE COURT: What kind of a group is it?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's a scientific group that
17
    deals with computational biology. We're based out of UCSD is
    where our home office is. We've got 3,000 members around the
18
    world, and I just do admin support for it and run reports and
19
20
     that for my supervisor.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. And your husband is a project
22
    manager?
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes.
24
               THE COURT: And could you tell us a little more
25
    about that, please.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He works for SAIC, and the project he works on is a security program for the government. I don't know exactly what it is, but it's some type of security. And he was in the Navy for over 22 years.

THE COURT: Okay. So you got the prior military in the family, got SAIC, government contractor work, you've got your husband working on a project related to that type of work. Anything about all of that inclines you to favor one side or the other in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you feel you have an affinity for the government because it's played a prominent part of your husband's life and --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And my life.

THE COURT: -- and your life as well by proxy, yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I feel that -- I know I can be fair and that the government has helped us in our career while he was in the military, but it's not -- I don't think it would be something that would influence my opinion at all.

THE COURT: Okay. In your -- in your response to the area entitled "Personal beliefs," you indicate some concern about certain acts taken in the name of God. Is it your view that the entire Muslim faith itself stands for killing in the name of God?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely not. I mean I don't know any Muslims personally, but I know that there are good people out there, but they're -- you just hear a lot.

THE COURT: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- in the news regarding, you know, killing in the name of God and --

THE COURT: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And I'm not a religious person, but I can't imagine killing someone in the name of your God; that doesn't make sense to me.

THE COURT: Or otherwise.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, or otherwise, sure.

You're right. You're right. Absolutely. I didn't mean to infer that.

THE COURT: I know that you're weren't suggesting that. But, you know, many people will say well, you know, there are good people out there, but I think that there needs to be an acceptance of the proposition that a vast, vast, vast majority of people who embrace the Muslim faith are people of peace and that if you can't embrace that, if you have a view that the faith is predicated upon violence or other problematic principles, then that needs to be discussed obviously. So is it your view that there are just a few people out there, a few good people that —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, no, no, no.

THE COURT: -- or do you have concerns about the 1 faith generally? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I think that the news 3 4 brings out those -- the bad ones, that the -- we only hear 5 about those incidents that are bad and just in general the 6 news is bad about everything, you know, I mean you don't hear 7 about those good people. It's very seldom. You know, sometimes on the news you'll see something about -- they'll 8 do a -- this is our good report for the day, and you hear one 9 little --10 11 THE COURT: Right. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- you know, bit of news. no, I'm a believer that the majority of people in this world 13 14 are good, and there's -- it's just the few that make it bad 15 for everyone. 16 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Smith. Ms. Salinas, 17 good morning. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 19 THE COURT: You're a high school teacher. 20 interested in knowing what courses you teach. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I teach English 12 for seniors, 22 AP literature for seniors, and also yearbook. THE COURT: AP literature. 23 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 25 THE COURT: That's pretty impressive. And how long have you been teaching at that level?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: This is my seventh year.

THE COURT: Okay. And where are you teaching, Sweetwater Union; is that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The school I teach is Olympian High School; it's part of the Sweetwater Union School District.

THE COURT: Very good. And your significant other is in sales involving what types of products or services?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He's my boyfriend, and he works at a retail store where they buy and sell used music and videos.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Thank you, Ms.

Salinas. Okay. Why don't we do this. Let's take our

midmorning recess at this point, and before you leave, ladies
and gentlemen, just let me say this. First of all, for those
of you in assigned seats, please know where you're seated
because when you come back, you'll be taking those same
seats.

Couple of other things I'd like to mention for the first time around here. I mentioned the admonition to you, but I'm going to give you the admonition at this point; of course it applies at all times. Please do not discuss this case amongst yourselves or with anyone else or allow yourselves to form or express any opinions on the case until

you are a juror and the jury has retired to deliberate, then 1 2 and only then. 3 And then finally, we always appreciate you promptly 4 returning following a recess. When we take a 15-minute 5 recess, please be outside waiting for us. We will call you 6 in for each new session of court. And I think that's it. 7 We'll see you in 15 minutes. 8 (The jury left the courtroom.) 9 THE COURT: Okay. Feel free to -- we'll give these 10 gentlemen a break. And if you want to use the facilities, 11 you certainly may. 12 (There was a break in the proceedings.) 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. 14 And, Ms. Boggess, we're going to resume with you, so we'll 15 get that microphone over to you. Good morning --16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 17 THE COURT: -- Ms. Boggess. Well, as I went 18 through your questionnaire, my leading impression was you 19 must have one of the most coveted jobs in the entire country 20 as being a supervisor at Costco. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know if you'd go that 22 far. 23 THE COURT: You get that a lot, do you? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 25 THE COURT: Twenty years. That's wonderful.

```
don't have any other -- I imagine you're supervising people
 1
 2
     there.
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, a lot of different kinds
 4
    of people, and I have an open mind of things. I supervise a
 5
    hundred different people at any given time, I work with a lot
 6
    of different kinds of people, and that's given me an open
 7
    mind too.
                          How many people do you supervise at any
 8
               THE COURT:
 9
    given point in time?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Probably 50 in a day; that's on
11
     the front end, so probably about 50 employees there a day.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you --
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
14
               THE COURT: -- Ms. Boggess. Okay. Mr. Breier?
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Yes. Good morning. You've got a
17
    number of relatives employed -- or some relatives employed by
18
     government. Anything about -- anything about family
19
     connection to government employment that could in any way
20
     influence you in this case?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: Okay. Don't feel any connection with
23
     the government in this case?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not at all.
25
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. I didn't have any
```

other questions of you, Mr. Breier. Thank you, sir. Okay. 1 2 Mr. Buckner, good morning. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 4 THE COURT: In connection with your employment at 5 Solar Turbines, are you in a supervisorial capacity as well, 6 sir? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In human resources I support 8 the managers and vice-presidents at our location. 9 THE COURT: Okay. As a senior principal are you 10 overseeing other people at the company? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I guess you could say that, yes. 12 13 THE COURT: Approximately --14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have no direct reports. 15 more of an individual contributor. 16 THE COURT: How long have you been with Solar Turbines? 17 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Forty-three years. THE COURT: And going over some of the jury 19 20 experience you've had, you've had the -- you sat on a civil 21 case basically back in '96, and this would probably be the 22 appropriate time to talk about the differences in burdens of 23 proof in civil cases as opposed to criminal cases. 24 Now, that was a while back. You may not recall

that the burden of proof in that case was a preponderance of

the evidence. Does that phrase ring familiar to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And for those of you, just to remind you, in civil cases the burden of proof, that is, the standard of persuasion which must be carried by the party with that burden is a preponderance of the evidence. So if this were a civil case, a traffic accident or a contract dispute, the plaintiff would have the obligation to establish by a preponderance of the evidence or that evidence that merely outweighs opposing evidence and thus has a greater probability of truth; that's the standard we see in civil cases.

In criminal cases of course the burden of proof is a much higher burden; it's on the government, as has already been explained to you, it's proof beyond a reasonable doubt, proof that leaves the jury firmly convinced that a defendant is guilty of a charge. You do understand the difference in that I'm sure, Mr. Buckner.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Okay, sir. And was that in superior court here in San Diego?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, it was.

THE COURT: All right. Across the street?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Buckner.

```
Mr. Murguia?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes, sir.
 3
               THE COURT: Good morning, sir, again.
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
 5
               THE COURT: How long have you been a facility
 6
    engineer at the hotel?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A little less than a year.
               THE COURT: And before that you had all these other
 8
 9
    positions, as a fabricator, a plumber, working shipyards,
10
     sales, and as a merchandiser; is that correct, sir?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes, sir.
12
               THE COURT: I believe that's the only question I
13
    had for you, Mr. Murguia. Thank you, sir. Ms. Free, good
14
    morning.
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Would you be a little more specific
17
    about your son's experiences in Africa, specifically in
18
     Uganda, where he was for five months. You indicated that he
19
    was there working with children, he was with an NGO, a
20
    nongovernmental organization. Could you be -- give us a
21
     little bit more information on that.
2.2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure. He is a videographer,
23
    and he went to film the children and adults who are involved
24
    in the Invisible Children NGO in their daily lives and their
```

cottage industries that are set up to support themselves and

further education, of rebuilding of schools that have been --1 2 and homes where children have been displaced. 3 THE COURT: Was that the name of -- is that the name of the NGO, Invisible Children? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 6 THE COURT: And how would the -- the product of 7 your son's efforts, any film, be utilized? I assume he was 8 filming for a purpose. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They're hoping to release a documentary. They've already been working on it ten years, 10 11 and they're just enhancing the original footage. They just keep adding to it. They're trying to keep the film to an 12 13 hour. I have no idea. It's already been ten years. I don't 14 know how much longer it's going to be. He is no longer, as 15 of November, working for them. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He has a different job now. 18 THE COURT: Okay. The NGO, was it sponsored by a 19 particular group or organization; do you know? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is its own -- it's a -- it's 21 its own nonprofit. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Does it --23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know how to explain it. 24 THE COURT: Does it work with governmental 25 agencies, U.S. governmental agencies?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not that I know of. I mean just these three young men went to Africa and didn't like what they saw and decided to make a documentary ten years ago, and they're still adding footage.

THE COURT: Okay. And it was all in Uganda?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.

THE COURT: He would explain to you what the experience was like, I assume, from time to time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, he -- they released little bits of their film kind of like teasers, so we would see that along with anybody else who is familiar with the organization.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about what your son did in connection with those efforts -- and they seem to be very laudatory efforts -- or any information he gave you about that experience or his observations of Ugandan society or children in need that could in any way influence you in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't believe so. It's very insulated to this one group of, you know, people that live there and, you know, what their daily lives, what they're experiencing. It's pretty -- it's a pretty tight-knit group actually, you know.

THE COURT: Okay. With respect to credibility or believability of law enforcement officers who may testify, I

```
took it from your response that you could judge law
 1
 2
    enforcement officers and their credibility as you would any
 3
     other witness who was not involved in law enforcement.
 4
     that what your intention was when you indicated "always" with
 5
    a question mark and them "probably but would take all
    evidence into consideration"?
 6
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. You spent quite a bit of time on
 9
     that this morning I know; I just wanted to be sure you didn't
10
    have any concerns along those lines. Thank you --
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Thank you, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: -- Ms. Free. Okay. Mr. Bristow, we
13
    have you next.
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: Good morning, sir. And you've been
16
    with Qualcomm for how long, sir?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Twelve years.
18
               THE COURT: And before that, any other employment
     that we should be aware of? That would have been you right
19
20
     out of high school if you --
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I had a couple jobs in
22
    high or actually one job after high school.
23
               THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. You and Ms. Boggess are --
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
25
               THE COURT: -- pretty nice.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We do well. 1 2 THE COURT: Anything about that contact with law 3 enforcement in 2010 that could in any way influence you in 4 this case? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 6 THE COURT: As far as you were concerned, was there 7 fair treatment --PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They treated me fairly. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. All right, sir. Thank you, Mr. Bristow. 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 12 THE COURT: And Ms. Cleavenger. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 14 THE COURT: Good morning. You're -- you're living with another individual at this point. I was just curious as 15 16 to what that individual does for an occupation, if anything. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He is a busboy at his family 18 restaurant. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. And, Ms. Cleavenger, 19 I don't have any other questions for you. Thank you. 20 21 Freni, good morning. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: First of all, in response to the 24 question concerning political identification, you didn't mark 25 anything, not even "none of the above." I just want to make

```
sure that question wasn't missed by you, the question that
 1
 2
     asks people whether they identify with Christian
 3
     conservatives, traditional conservatives, libertarians,
 4
    moderates, liberal/progressives, or independents.
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I must have missed the
 6
     question.
 7
               THE COURT: I'm sorry?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And I didn't mark anything?
 9
               THE COURT: And you didn't mark "none of the
10
     above," no.
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Then I just skipped it by
12
     accident.
13
               THE COURT: Okay.
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Can you give me the choices
15
    again?
            Sorry.
16
               THE COURT: Sure. We have Christian conservatives
17
     traditional conservatives, Libertarians, moderates,
18
     liberals/progressives -- stop me when I get to --
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would say a little bit of all
20
     of them.
21
               THE COURT: Well, we don't have all of the above.
22
     That's what you were looking for. And independents.
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. We'll go on to
25
     something else if you don't have any strong identification
```

```
with any of those.
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, neither way.
 3
               THE COURT: Sure, sure. Okay. So you're keeping
 4
     the books for your father --
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
               THE COURT: -- who had a very interesting job.
 6
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 8
               THE COURT: And he was working in that service,
 9
    with the U.S. Secret Service, for how long?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, gosh. Probably 1960 to
11
    about 1972.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. Always in the presidential
13
    quard?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: When we moved to San Diego, he
    worked with the Treasury here, and also when Nixon would come
15
16
     to San Clemente he would --
17
               THE COURT: Spring into action?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
19
               THE COURT: And your husband is an attorney?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
21
               THE COURT: And tell us a little bit about what his
    practice has been and what it is now at the present time.
22
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He's a civil trial attorney.
    He does business, real estate, some elder abuse cases.
24
25
               THE COURT: That's here in the San Diego area?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Is he with a firm or by himself?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He has his own firm.
 3
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. And has he ever practiced
 5
     criminal law in the past? Was he affiliated with a
 6
    prosecutorial office or a defense attorney?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. It's always been in the civil
 9
    arena; is that correct?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
               THE COURT: Is he a trial lawyer?
11
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes.
13
               THE COURT: Your father's business now is
14
     consisting of what so that you're helping him?
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He's a private lender, real
16
     estate lender. He lives in Florida now, but he has some
17
     loans here in California as well as Indiana and Florida; so I
18
    keep all of the loan ledgers and basically all of his books
19
    from his purchases and get his books ready for taxes each
20
     vear.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Do you work with your husband at
2.2
     all? Even though he's got a firm, his own firm, you
23
    indicated, do you assist him as well?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do some of the accounting,
25
    yes, on just online. I don't go to the office; I'm able to
```

```
just sign onto his server, so I do the payroll and reconcile
 1
 2
     the accounts.
               THE COURT: Okay. He doesn't have you appear for
 3
 4
    him in depositions and -- no?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. Very good.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He has an assistant.
 7
 8
               THE COURT: This would be John Freni, would it not?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: Okay. He's known to many of us. Thank
11
    you, Ms. Freni.
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
13
               THE COURT: All right. Let's see. Mr. Todd, you
14
    are next up. Mr. Todd, good morning.
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
16
               THE COURT: I know you recently substituted in, and
17
    I did have an opportunity to go over your questionnaire, I
18
    want you to know that, but I really don't have any questions
    for you, sir. Just checking one more time. No. Mr. Todd,
19
20
    anything you'd like to -- any thoughts you may have or
21
     questions or concerns relative to what we're doing here,
2.2
    nature of the case, following any of the instructions?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not really. Not really.
23
24
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Very good. Thank
25
     you. Ms. Delaney, good morning.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: In terms of your prior jury service,
 3
    you did have -- you did sit on a case which in all
 4
    probability took place in this courthouse.
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 6
               THE COURT: And that was back in the what, 2001
 7
    or --
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 2009.
 9
               THE COURT: 2009?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, in that ballpark.
11
    don't know the exact year.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. And was that particular
13
    experience acceptable for you?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15
               THE COURT: Okay. Do you see anyone here in the
16
     courtroom who was associated with that earlier case? And by
17
    here I'm referring basically to --
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The attorneys.
19
               THE COURT: -- the government's counsel table.
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Very good. All right. Thank
22
     you, Ms. Delaney. And then we go to Ms. Hernandez. Good
23
    morning.
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
25
               THE COURT: What types of cases do you work on as a
```

```
county case worker?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work with public assistance,
 3
    providing public assistance.
 4
               THE COURT: I see you bobbing and weaving there,
 5
    yeah.
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Medi-Cal, food stamps, cash
 7
    aid.
 8
               THE COURT: How many case files do you work on at
 9
    any given point in time?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In a week -- I mean it could be
10
11
    25 cases in a week, sometimes more, sometimes less. Just
12
     depends on the time of the month.
               THE COURT: Are you out of the office a good deal
13
    of the time?
14
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, we work in the office --
16
               THE COURT: In the office and --
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- interviewing clients when
18
    they come in to apply for assistance.
19
               THE COURT: So you don't do home visits or that
20
    kind of thing?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Shakes head)
               THE COURT: Okay. You probably see a pretty good
22
23
    mix of people I would think.
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I do.
25
               THE COURT: Okay. Have you seen any members of the
```

```
Somali community that you can recall?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't believe so, no.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. How long have you been doing
 4
     this now?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have been doing this for a
 6
    year.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. And before that you were a loan
 8
    underwriter and working in banking?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
10
               THE COURT: Very good. I did want to ask you about
11
     that circumstance involving your brother where he was --
    where he was a victim and your stepbrother, who was not the
12
13
     victim --
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.
15
               THE COURT: -- in a separate matter. As far as you
16
    were concerned, did the criminal justice system work in those
17
     cases?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
19
               THE COURT: But --
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I mean I feel that -- yes.
21
     one there was really know way to find the people, so they --
22
               THE COURT: This is your brother.
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My brother. And my stepbrother
24
     committed a crime and that's the punishment.
25
               THE COURT: You think he was fairly treated?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Nothing about the family or within the
 3
     family that you're aware of that was critical about the
 4
     response or how your brother-in-law was treated?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you,
 7
    Ms. Hernandez. Ms. Ramirez, good morning.
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
 9
               THE COURT: Is your position at your company as a
10
     financial planner, an advisor, a broker; what do you do
11
     there?
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work for the brokers.
13
               THE COURT: Okay.
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I'm more on the client
15
    service side; I'm called a client associate.
16
               THE COURT: Okay.
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Client assistant.
18
               THE COURT: What kinds of things do you do there?
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do things like update cost
20
    basis for taxes, I prepare performance reports on portfolios,
21
     I order replacement Visa cards, move funds between accounts.
22
               THE COURT: Sounds like you do an awful lot.
23
     Updating cost basis for tax purposes, is that oftentimes a
24
    difficult and challenging task?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Very much so. With the law
```

```
1
    changes, yes.
 2
               THE COURT: What you do if you just don't have
 3
    sufficient information?
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We usually have the
 5
    information.
                   It's the hoops you go through to make changes
 6
    because say someone received a stock as a gift or something
 7
     like that -- it's just the data entry of it is the cumbersome
 8
    part.
 9
               THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Ramirez. Okay. Ms.
10
     Fierro?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
12
               THE COURT: Good morning.
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
14
               THE COURT: Could you tell me a little bit about
15
    what your son does in New York in the profession.
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, he's a corporate lawyer.
17
    He works for the Sidley Austin law firm, and he doesn't do
18
    trials; he does a lot of contracts. I don't know. He says
    he works with a lot of money. I don't really know too much
19
20
     about it. I'm just amazed he's there.
21
               THE COURT: He does transactional work at --
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I guess.
23
               THE COURT: -- I assume. Okay. And did he ever
24
    practice criminal law; do you know?
25
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, he did not. He went to

Berkeley Law. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. And are there any other 3 attorneys in the family? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. He's the first one in our 5 family who got there. Very proud of him. 6 THE COURT: Very good. Okay. Thank you, Ms. 7 Fierro. Ms. Stahl? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 9 THE COURT: Good morning. I went through your 10 questionnaire, and at this point I don't think I have any 11 questions of you. Anything -- anything that's been said this 12 morning in the courtroom or yesterday that causes you any 13 concern about your ability to be a fair and impartial juror 14 in this case? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Okay. All right, Ms. Stahl. 17 you. Mr. Crowell, good morning. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. THE COURT: When it came to the personal beliefs 19 20 section, I just wanted to explore with you a little bit of 21 that as I have with some of your fellow panel members. When 22 it came to the question about Islamic teachings or doctrine 23 that might be personally offensive to you, you indicated 24 "some doctrine is against my beliefs," and I just wanted to

give you a chance to talk about that a little bit, whether

that's a concern you have across the board about the entire Islamic faith or whether it was of a more limited nature.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Probably more of a limited nature. You know, there's just aspects, you know, between who comes first -- country, family, religion all that. I think it's a little different in this culture.

THE COURT: Anything about your understanding of the Islamic faith or its teachings that would make it difficult for you to sit as a fair and impartial juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, it would not.

THE COURT: As I mentioned previously, the issues in this case are going to be pretty discrete; they're pretty well-defined. You know, the charges in the case are providing material support or conspiring to provide material support to terrorists or a terrorist organization, and whether that was done or wasn't done, nobody -- nobody is trying to portray al-Shabaab in a positive light; the question is whether or not there was support, and that's, as I say, a pretty discrete, you know, defined question ultimately. So if there are -- if you have some general -- not some general but some specific concerns about Islamic teaching, which I'm still not completely sure of, and would any of those teachings color your thinking on the obligation you have to judge the evidence fairly and to look at these

```
discrete, very discrete issues in this case?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't believe so.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. All right, sir. Thank you, Mr.
 4
     Crowell.
              Okay. Mr. Brenzel?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 6
               THE COURT: Mr. Brenzel, I don't think I have any
 7
    questions of you either at this point, but I would ask you
 8
    whether there is anything you'd like to volunteer, any
 9
     concerns you may have, any doubts you may have about your
     ability to be fair and impartial based upon what you've been
10
11
    hearing the last few days.
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, nothing.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. Mr. Dominguez?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
15
               THE COURT: Good morning. Were you -- you had your
16
     own -- you're a contractor I assume.
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: General building contractor.
18
               THE COURT: General contractor, licensed general
19
     contractor.
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
21
               THE COURT: And I assume that the company's still
22
     active, that when you put down unemployed, that threw me a
23
     little bit --
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
25
               THE COURT: -- because you're the company.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm no longer licensed.
 1
 2
    it expire.
 3
               THE COURT: You let it expire.
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I dissolved the corporation.
 5
               THE COURT: Got you. Okay. When did that happen,
 6
     sir?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It happened in 2010.
 8
               THE COURT: And pretty recently. What's been
 9
    happening since then?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just been, you know, doing odd
11
    jobs, taking it easy.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. How long were you in building or
13
    doing contracting work?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Officially since I was 18, but,
14
    you know, before that with my dad.
15
               THE COURT: When did you first get your license?
16
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I became licensed in '97.
18
               THE COURT: Were you working as an RMO or an RME on
    his license and then took that over or --
19
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Got your own license then?
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
                                                          Thank
     you, Mr. Dominguez. Mr. Merkin?
24
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
```

```
THE COURT: Good morning, sir.
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
               THE COURT: Can you tell me what your background
 3
 4
    has been in legal practice.
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I'll try to make it
 6
    short, but I was --
 7
               THE COURT: Is that microphone out again?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
 9
               THE COURT: No? That's good.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'll hold it closer.
10
11
    got out of law school, I went into the Army, Judge Advocate
12
     General Corps, and in that capacity they sent me to Germany,
13
    and my job was trying or defending general courts martial; I
14
     did that for almost three years. Then I came -- went back to
15
    El Paso, Texas, where I spent most of my career, and I
16
    practiced law there, general civil law, but it turned into a
17
    trial practice, and I practiced there from 19 -- early 1957 I
18
     guess it was until 1989, when I retired and came out here.
19
    But I was involved in -- in civil litigation, primarily in
20
    trial work.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Did you ever practice criminal
22
     law?
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did, sir.
24
               THE COURT: When was that?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, first of course in the
```

JAG Corps. 1 2 THE COURT: Yeah, sure. But aside from that. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And then early in my career, I 4 handled a number of criminal cases, but my practice veered 5 more and more towards civil practice. And I would say that 6 my criminal practice was not more than 5 percent of my work, 7 but occasionally I would do some criminal work for a client that I had or a new one. 8 9 THE COURT: So it wasn't ever the pure practice of law or a practice where you had a substantial percentage of 10 11 your practice devoted to criminal law except maybe in the 12 very beginning there. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct, sir. 14 THE COURT: But after that, after that beginning, 15 then you'd handle criminal matters as they might pop up for 16 your civil clients and that was never any more than about 17 five --18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Essentially few and far 19 between. 20 THE COURT: But for that period of time when you 21 were concentrating on criminal --2.2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes --23 THE COURT: -- first in --24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- somewhat. 25 THE COURT: -- civilian practice, how long was that

period? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I would say that my 3 criminal work was probably essentially maybe 40 or 50 percent 4 in my earlier career, and that must have been over a period 5 of two or three years. 6 THE COURT: What kinds of matters did you handle, 7 everything or did you specialize? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I never handled a capital case, 9 but if you named anything else, there's a pretty fair chance that I was involved in it. 10 11 THE COURT: And it would have been defense work. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That was defense work, sir, yes. 13 14 THE COURT: Okay. And where -- that was in El 15 Paso? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: All right. Did you practice law in 18 California at any point? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I'm an arbitrator out here 19 20 with the American Arbitration Association and for the 21 Financial Industry Resources Authority, FINRA. 22 THE COURT: And how often are you in arbitration? 23 What percentage of your time right now is devoted to 24 arbitration? 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Between 5 and 10 percent, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. If you're on the jury, could you cast aside all of your legal education and experience and just confine -- confine yourself to the evidence in this case and the law ultimately that's provided?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am who I am, but I really, truly believe that I'm a disciplined person, and I can base my judgment on what I hear and nothing more.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you, Mr. Merkin.
Mr. Evans?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, sir.

THE COURT: Good morning. I needed to clarify a couple of responses in the personal belief section of the -- of the questionnaire where you indicate your view of the Muslim or Islamic faith as being a peaceful faith except for extremists and followers. Then a little farther down, indicating or including a reference to Muslim extremists.

The question I would have for you is the question I had for a few of your fellow panel members. Are you -- in terms of the references to extremists or violence, are you limiting that to a -- to a specific and small group of individuals and/or organizations or are you more or less applying that generally to the Muslim or Islamic faith?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I meant a small number.

It's a very few. The -- no, religion -- no -- has that

extremist view in which it's -- how can I explain it? I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

```
guess, it's from -- like the other person that said from the
    news you get a small percentage of the bad news, and it's not
    the whole faith, it's just a small percentage that has that
    extremist view that, you know, we can't help but hear about,
    so --
              THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you, Mr. Evans.
    Ms. Alise?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
              THE COURT: I am looking for your questionnaire
    because I know you -- I know you came in a bit late.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                  I did?
              THE COURT: No, no. I mean you were seated late,
13
    were you not? You took over for Mr. Mapanao.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
              THE COURT: So I am -- if you'd give me just a
    moment --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Would you like me to sing?
              THE COURT: We would appreciate it, and --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, yes.
              THE COURT: From the sound of it, I --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Zip-a-dee-doo-dah --
              THE COURT: -- think you can entertain us as well.
23
    I'll be with you very shortly, I promise.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- zip-a-dee-ay.
              THE COURT: I did have an opportunity to review
```

your questionnaire, and after all of that, I must say I 1 really don't have any questions. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, let me just thank you for 3 4 your sense of humor. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. 6 Alise. Okay. Mr. Adams? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 8 THE COURT: And I don't have any follow-up 9 questions for you as well. You indicated that you knew 10 somebody in the horn -- well, in Kenya, which is -- which neighbors -- I believe neighbors Somalia, and --11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe so, yes. 13 THE COURT: -- anything about that particular 14 friendship or information that you might have gained from that part of the world and knowing this gentleman most of 15 16 your life that could in any way influence you in this case? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not really. He moved here when 18 he was about 20 I believe, and I believe he's 55 now, and 19 he's just tried to assimilate himself to the U.S. And he was 20 a citizen when I met him. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Thank you. Thank 22 you, Mr. Adams. Okay. Ms. Clark, you're the person 23 everybody's been waiting to hear from. 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 25

THE COURT: Good morning. And, you know, the

question I had for you relates to the question about law enforcement, question number 50, would you always believe a law enforcement officer over other witnesses. And you indicated yes. And I wanted to explore that with you. I didn't know whether you answered that in error, that you meant no, but then I saw that your father-in-law is CHP, and I thought maybe there was a family -- just a family connection or influence there that would cause you to say that. So would you just explain a little bit, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't -- didn't mean so much greater, would give it greater importance or it would be more truthful; but I thought that everybody that goes up there, you know, says their oath too, saying the truth, and so I think that, you know, they do tell the truth, I hope so, and I feel that I believe that everybody up there will tell the truth, their own truth, and it's up to us to decide whether that truth --

THE COURT: Well, do you think law enforcement officers are more truthful than people who are not in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So I shouldn't be concerned at all or counsel shouldn't be concerned at all that you checked "yes" on your questionnaire?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not more truthful. I'm

assuming each person that takes the oath --1 2 THE COURT: Oh, I see. By "yes" you meant --3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- is going to say --4 THE COURT: Go ahead. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. -- is going to say the 6 truth, and that's our duty to judge that. 7 THE COURT: It is your responsibility as judges of 8 the facts to determine the believability of witnesses. And as I stated previously and more than once, you do that by, 9 you know, making observations, just relying on your common 10 11 sense, looking at the manner of the individual testifying, the quality and character of testimony, and all the other 12 13 things. And nobody should start with an advantage over 14 anyone else by having a jury thinking that before they even 15 take the stand that they're more truthful than other 16 witnesses who testify. Do you agree with that? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely. 18 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Very good.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Very good. Then we'll retrieve that microphone from you. I'm just -- I'm going to wrap things up for myself here in just a -- in just a minute or two, and then you're going to hear from counsel. Each side has a limited period of time, ladies and gentlemen, within which to follow up and ask any questions they -- that are appropriate and fair, and they'll begin that in just a few minutes, but I wanted to end on this note.

19

20

21

22

23

24

Yesterday, once again, I spent quite a bit of time talking about the presumption of innocence, a bedrock constitutional principle, and I tried to explain to everyone, I tried to convey the very, very important principle that these constitutional principles matter, they have meaning, they're not just sayings, they're not just words. And I mentioned some of the consequences or applications of the presumption of innocence, that is, that a defendant is presumed innocent until and unless the contrary is proven, until and unless the burden on the government is carried. And I just want to emphasize a few of those things at this point.

A defendant in a criminal case, in any criminal case, never carries the burden of proving anything. A defendant in a criminal case has no responsibility to put on a case, to call witnesses, to introduce evidence, to cross-examine witnesses called by the government, even to make an opening statement or to make a closing argument at the end of the case. None of this is imposed upon a defendant because of these principles that I'm just discussing.

And I spoke at some length about the constitutional right for a defendant not to testify, to decide not to testify. And I mentioned that you cannot hold that against any defendant who might exercise that constitutional right.

You may not draw any negative inferences from a defendant 1 2 deciding not to testify. You may not discuss that in 3 deliberations. You may not consider that as a factor in your 4 deliberations. 5 If there is anyone here who has any difficulty 6 accepting any of these principles, would you please raise 7 your hand at the present time. I see no hands raised. If there's anyone here who would be inclined to 8 hold it against a defendant or draw negative inferences if a 9 defendant decided not to testify, would you please raise your 10 11 hand. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a question about that. 13 THE COURT: Yes, yes, Mr. Bilse? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If there's a gap that could 15 have been explained if a defendant had testified, how -- how 16 would we take that then? 17 THE COURT: If there is a gap in the evidence, then 18 that's not the responsibility of the defendant to fill that in. 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Say there's an explanation that 21 could have been --22 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- maybe not a gap in the 24 evidence but an issue that could have been resolved --25

THE COURT: If --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- if a defendant had spoken and just that lack, it just remains a blank, a gap.

THE COURT: Well, it may well be a failure of proof on the part of the government to fill in that gap. It's the government's responsibility to present evidence on all of the elements of a charge. Each charge is going to have certain parts to it, certain what we call elements to -- of a crime, and it's the government's responsibility to introduce evidence sufficient to convince a jury beyond a reasonable doubt that each of those elements have been met. So if there's a gap in the evidence -- and I'm speaking very generally because you're speaking very generally -- if there's a gap in the evidence, you certainly may not say well, gee, it might have been easy for the defendant to answer this if the defendant had taken the stand. No, you can't do that.

First of all -- first of all, you're -- you're not just speculating at that point, you're already discussing it, you're discussing it with other jurors in your hypothetical situation, in the scenario that you're -- you can't do that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But flipping it to say well, the evidence was A, B, C, D that a person was at a certain point and there was some evidence that they were there and if there's nothing to refute that, then -- and a defendant could have come up to speak to that point, you know, you take it

just as evidence and that's it then?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You look at the evidence that has been brought out during the course of the trial. You cannot -you cannot hold it -- in other words, in your hypothetical situation, you seem to be saying, you know, there's evidence that a defendant could have provided, an explanation -- let's take it away from -- let's take it away from this case entirely and talk about, you know, a case where we're dealing with a -- I don't know -- a burglary, okay. And all of the evidence points -- not all of the evidence but, you know, a substantial amount of evidence points to a defendant in a particular case. And the issue, you know, the real issue is identity, who did it, did this defendant do it or was it someone else. And you'd think it would be really easy if this defendant had an alibi, a so-called alibi and take the stand and tell everybody where he was at that particular point in time. The defendant in that case would have absolutely no obligation to do that. You would have to look at the evidence produced by the government in that case and decide on the basis of all the evidence whether the government has proven by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the particular defendant in that case was the guy.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good explanation.

THE COURT: And there would never be any obligation on the part of a defendant to take the stand and explain

where he was at the time the offense was committed.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: Do you understand? Do you accept that though? I mean that's the important thing.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I do, yes.

THE COURT: You know, what you raise, Mr. Bilse, is a very human reaction: Gee, you know, I'd be curious, I'd be curious to know what a defendant might say if he did take the stand and testify. But that's exactly the exercise you cannot engage in because in a sense you're violating -- and this is important for you to understand -- you're violating a defendant's constitutional right when you do that, when you hold a defendant's decision against him where that decision has been not to testify.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's what I was kind of worried about.

THE COURT: Okay. But I'm going to keep this -- I know that horse is sitting in the well right now and he's pretty battered, but I'm going to beat a little bit more on it because it's really -- it's really important.

You know, many of you would raise your hands saying yeah, you'd be curious about what a defendant might have to say if called to the stand, but you've got to cast aside that curiosity; you cannot speculate what the testimony might have been, you can't consider it, you can't discuss it. You'd

insist on the exact same thing, the exact same constitutional protection if you were the one who was charged with an offense and the government had its burden to prove you guilty or a loved one guilty; you'd embrace that constitutional principle. And so we all have a right to expect that it's going to be honored in this and every other case.

So does anyone else have any concerns about these last principles I've been discussing? If so, raise your hand, please. If you feel that if you don't hear from a defendant, or any of them, that this is going to influence you, probably influence you, could very possibly influence you, that you might be tempted to discuss it in the jury deliberation room if you're on the jury, now's the time to raise your hand and let us know. All right. I see no hands.

Okay. Let me -- we're going to start with the attorneys here. Well, actually we're pretty close to noon. I'm going to ask counsel -- perhaps rather than having Ms. Moreno start and then interrupt her 10 or 15 minutes into it, why don't we take our noon recess at this time. We will resume -- at 1:15 I'm going to ask that you be outside the courtroom doors so we can bring you in. Each side -- hold on, ladies and gentlemen. Each side is going to have that opportunity. They are limited in time. We've spent almost two days on this already, and we will have our jurors identified by the end of the day, by the close of business

today; that's our goal, and so we do appreciate you promptly being back here.

Remember the admonition not to discuss the case or make any decisions at this time. Remember where you're seated. Enjoy your time off. We'll see you at 1:15.

(The jury panel left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. We're outside the presence of all jurors. Ms. Moreno, are you planning on taking your -- all of your allotted time, do you think you will or -- I'm not asking for a commitment, I'm just trying to get --

MS. MORENO: No, no, I'm trying to give my best estimate, your Honor. I think, depending upon the dynamic, maybe 40, 45 minutes.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Cole? I'm sorry. Mr. Ward?

MR. GHAPPOUR: Your Honor, I think it would be like

15 or 20 minutes.

awful lot; it's been pretty -- we have kind of an awful lot of information here already. The reason I ask, Ms. Fontier did inquire yesterday as to the possibility of going over these deposition issues, getting rulings on those. I'd love to be able to do that for counsel today. I've got to be out of here at a fairly decent hour late this afternoon, and -- I mean I can't hang with you to until 7:00 or 8:00 to get this stuff done, so I want to do it, want to give Ms. Fontier a

chance to get her stuff -- and the government as well -- get
-- you know, know what's coming in and what's not coming in.

So to the extent we can be expeditious in going through the
rest of the voir dire, getting our jurors identified, letting
the rest go, then getting to our deposition issues, that
would serve us well.

MS. MORENO: I'll do my best, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll see you at 1:15.

MS. FONTIER: Thank you, your Honor.

(There was a break in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

We're going to continue now. Now is the opportunity for counsel to participate in this process. They each have some time to ask you follow-up questions, perhaps a few questions of their own. I can assure you they have no purpose in unduly prying into your personal affairs or embarrassing you. They're just merely trying to elicit a little more information that might bear upon your ability to be fair and impartial in this case. And so we will first proceed with Ms. Moreno.

MS. MORENO: Thank you, your Honor. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm going to stand here so I can see everyone. Can everyone hear me? Okay. After 30 years of being a lawyer, I should think that I should know how to project my voice, but if anyone has any problems

hearing what I'm saying, please let me know.

My name is Linda Moreno, and I have the privilege of representing Mr. Mohamud. I will be asking a few of you some more questions, not all of you; I won't be talking to all of you. I'm going to try to do this as expeditiously as possible, but what I need from you, what's important is that you -- we have a real dialog, that you tell me what your thoughts are in the particular questions that I'm going to go into because only you know what's really in your heart, and we are all here entitled to know on this day, in this courtroom, what is in your heart with respect to certain questions.

So as his Honor told you, I have no intention to embarrass you or to be unduly intrusive, but -- but my -- the gentlemen here have a right to know, just as you would, if this is the right case for -- for you to sit on. There are no right or wrong answers here; nothing that you say is wrong. We're just looking for honesty, for candor, for you to tell us how you really feel.

And the other thing about this process is any of you who hear a juror say something that you want to comment on or something that I've said, just raise your hand because I want it to be a collaborative, dynamic process as much as possible. All right? We know the ground rules.

So with that said, I understand that speaking in

```
front of a bunch of strangers, especially in front of a bunch
 1
 2
    of strange lawyers, is not an easy thing to do, but it's my
 3
     job to ask you to please do that. So as I said, I'm not
 4
     going to speak to everyone, and really I'm going to focus my
 5
     inquire on either answers you gave to his Honor or some
 6
    answers that you gave in the questionnaire. And so I'd like
 7
    to start with Ms. Farkas. Good afternoon.
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
 9
               MS. MORENO: Can you hear me?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can hear you very well.
11
               MS. MORENO: Thank you. All right.
12
               THE COURT: Excuse me. If either of the
13
    interpreters has any difficulty hearing -- because I know Ms.
14
    Moreno may have her back to you -- please let me know; raise
15
    your hand or stand up or --
16
               THE INTERPRETER: Thank you, your Honor.
17
    appreciate it.
18
               THE COURT: -- and we'll let her know, sir. Thank
19
    you.
20
               MS. MORENO: Thank you. There you are.
                                                        So when
21
    you got the questionnaire -- and this is to everyone -- when
2.2
     you got the questionnaire, Ms. Farkas, you knew that it was
23
     important to be as candid as possible in the questionnaire?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
```

MS. MORENO: Is that fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, it is. 1 2 MS. MORENO: And the reason you knew that, well, 3 one you signed an oath to be truthful, correct? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 4 5 MS. MORENO: And, in fact, you gave us some very 6 interesting answers to some of the questions, so I need to 7 explore a little bit of that with you, all right? I think 8 that in one of the questions -- and I'm going to refresh your recollection --9 10 THE COURT: Ms. Moreno, excuse me. We have one 11 juror who's having difficulty hearing you. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: When you're facing that way, I 13 can't hear you. 14 THE COURT: It's a big courtroom, Ms. Alise We're 15 happy to give you a lapel mike. 16 MS. MORENO: That could be dangerous, your Honor, 17 but I'll take it. 18 THE COURT: Use the lectern. You can maybe move one of those mikes around a little bit. 19 20 MS. MORENO: You can now hear me. I won't be 21 singing for you though; I'm not going there. All right. 22 Down to the really serious business here -- and this is for 23 us extremely serious -- you were asked in the questionnaire 24 "Do you have any experiences, feelings, impressions, or

beliefs about the United States's response to terrorism that

would make it difficult for you to listen with an open mind 1 2 and render a verdict based solely on the evidence presented 3 in court and the judge's legal instructions?" And you 4 checked "Yes," and you said "I think we are being far too 5 fair in most cases." And I'm assuming that you -- you really 6 thought about that answer; is that fair? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's fair. MS. MORENO: Okay. And, in fact, his Honor did 8 9 question you a little bit about that, and I was writing 10 notes, and you said -- you used words like you -- and remember what I said, there are no wrong answers. And I can 11 12 tell that you're an opinionated person like we all are, and 13 I'm not asking you to defend your opinions, I'm just asking 14 you how you feel about them, all right? So you said -- you used words like "too tolerant" I think when you were talking 15 16 to the Court, that a lot of Americans feel the need to be 17 stronger, not giving in to demands --18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. 19 MS. MORENO: -- and what we need to know -- and of 20 course we all want to be perceived as being fair --21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Of course. MS. MORENO: -- but we're not. We are in some 22 23 situations; would you agree? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Of course. 25 MS. MORENO: And in other situations we're not

because we are flawed human beings, and so some cases would 1 2 be good for some jurors and other cases would not. And would 3 you agree with me that in a case that has charges that are related to terrorism, this is a very -- can be a very 4 5 emotional issue for jurors. And it does -- and listen 6 because I'm going to be asking other jurors about this -- and 7 it does inspire strong feelings; would you agree with me? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would agree. MS. MORENO: When you wrote your questionnaire, you 9 10 expressed strong feelings; is that fair? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fair. 12 MS. MORENO: And when his Honor was questioning 13 you, you -- you continued, and you talked about how in your 14 view we're a little perhaps too tolerant about what's going on in the area of terrorism? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 17 MS. MORENO: I take you back to the question 18 because you were asked "Would it make it difficult for you to listen with an open mind on this case," and you said "Yes." 19 20 And I don't think your opinion has changed, has it, from an 21 hour ago or two hours ago; is that fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Maybe I jumped on that a little too fast. I feel I can judge this fairly as a juror in this particular case. Not that I'm backtracking, I just feel that so often when we hear things through the media, and what we

22

23

24

```
see has to do with extremist Muslims, that it brings us to a
 1
 2
    boil on the surface, and that makes us feel extreme emotion.
 3
    To me, this isn't about extremists, but I believe my feelings
 4
    here would be fair. When I was filling out the
 5
    questionnaire, of course I was thinking of extremists, and
 6
     all Muslims of course are not extremists.
 7
               MS. MORENO: May I ask you though, but in --
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Of course.
 8
 9
               MS. MORENO: -- in some of these questions you were
10
     just asked about Muslims, you weren't asked about extremists;
11
     do you remember that?
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
13
               MS. MORENO: And in your response -- for instance,
14
     you were asked what's your view, if any, of the Muslim or
15
     Islamic faith, and what you said was "I think most are good
16
     people, but they don't feel women are equal to men."
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
18
               MS. MORENO: So who is the they in that sentence?
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Muslims generally.
20
               MS. MORENO: Muslims generally?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
22
               MS. MORENO: And so that's a perception that you
23
    have?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, right.
25
               MS. MORENO: All right. And you know that all of
```

```
the gentlemen seated at this table are all Muslim?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes.
 3
              MS. MORENO: And so I guess you have a variety of
 4
     opinions -- by the way, which may be shared by others, which
 5
    is perfectly fine --
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.
 7
              MS. MORENO: -- because I don't think you know any
    Muslims, do you?
 8
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   I do.
10
              MS. MORENO: Oh, you do. That's right. How is it
11
     that you have contact with them again?
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Through some business and just
13
    generally through vendors that I deal with.
14
               MS. MORENO: Oh, that's right. Cab drivers you
    said, et cetera?
15
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
17
              MS. MORENO: Okay. And you also put socially. How
18
    is that? Do you have any friends who are Muslims?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Friends of friends, not close
19
20
     friends of mine.
21
               MS. MORENO: Okay. In question 18, the next
22
     question, you were asked "Is there anything about Islamic
23
     teachings or doctrine that is personally offensive to you?"
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
25
              MS. MORENO: And you said "Yes," and you said that
```

they can be taught at an early age to hate and that anyone 1 2 who doesn't agree with their doctrine is an infidel. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. 4 MS. MORENO: Now, in this case I dare say that 5 there will be evidence about Islam and about terrorism, 6 sharia law, his Honor mentioned al-Qaeda yesterday. How can 7 we feel confident that, given that milieu of what's coming and given your answers, that you really could be fair, that 8 you could put these opinions aside and sort of really you'd 9 10 have to back away from what you wrote here. 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, as the judge mentioned, you're supposed to judge just what's going on in this 12 13 courtroom. 14 MS. MORENO: Right. That's right. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 16 MS. MORENO: Yes, that's right, but -- that's 17 absolutely, right. But some of us can't do that. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, you have to. 19 MS. MORENO: Well, and what I'm saying to you is 20 that I think that some people, a lot of people, me included, 21 have strongly held opinions and beliefs. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. 23 MS. MORENO: And it would -- I could not put them 24 aside. Are you saying you could put your opinions and 25

beliefs aside?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I hope I can.
 1
 2
              MS. MORENO: Well, that's a great answer. I
 3
     appreciate that. "I hope I can." So you kind of believe so;
     is -- would that be fair?
 4
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe so.
 6
               MS. MORENO: But what if we asked you, you have to
 7
    express an unequivocal commitment? It's a tough standard,
 8
     right? Do you agree?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I agree.
10
              MS. MORENO: To being fair?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   I agree.
12
              MS. MORENO: And I think that that's what the law
13
    requires. Given your answers -- and I hope you don't think
14
    I'm picking on you because --
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not at all.
16
              MS. MORENO: -- please forgive me. I'm just --
17
    it's important that we do this, and soon I'll be going on and
18
    torturing someone else.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't, I don't find it
19
20
    torture at all.
21
               MS. MORENO: I appreciate that. I appreciate that.
    But can you really tell us that you could do that and have an
22
23
    unequivocal commitment to being fair?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, the only way I can base
24
25
    it is I hope that someone could do that if I was in their
```

```
position.
 1
 2
               MS. MORENO: I think that's a terrific answer, but
 3
    it sort of begs the question because to say that you hope you
 4
    could do it -- I think what I need to know is -- and if you
 5
    can't do it and if I'm not being fair, please tell me -- but
 6
    I don't think you can tell us unequivocally that you could be
 7
    fair given -- given -- given some, you know, widely held
 8
     opinions and beliefs about terrorism and et cetera in this
 9
     country and Islam.
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, ma'am, if you feel you
     know me better than I do, so be it.
11
12
               MS. MORENO: No --
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just feel that I could do it.
14
               MS. MORENO: Okay.
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Okay.
16
               MS. MORENO: All right. Thank you.
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You're welcome.
18
               MS. MORENO: Mr. Breier, hi.
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Hi.
20
               MS. MORENO: You're next. Mr. Breier, thank you
21
    for your -- you have your mike?
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, ma'am.
23
               MS. MORENO: Thank you for your service to our
24
     country, Mr. Breier.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.

MS. MORENO: I have some questions to ask you which 1 2 I think if you were sitting in my client's position you would 3 want me to ask, and that is --4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure. 5 MS. MORENO: -- you have what I call the trifecta 6 of radio listening hosts, and that would be Rush Limbaugh, 7 Sean Hannity, and Roger Hedgecock; is that fair? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's fair. 8 9 MS. MORENO: Okay. Now, is it fair to say that Mr. 10 Limbaugh and Mr. Hannity are conservative voices in our 11 democracy, and they also have very strong negative opinions 12 about Islam; is that fair? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's fair. 14 MS. MORENO: Okay. Mr. Hedgecock I don't know as much, but he is also a conservative voice, correct? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, yes. 17 MS. MORENO: But certainly Mr. Limbaugh has been 18 quite incendiary about his comments regarding Muslims, correct? 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 21 MS. MORENO: And Mr. Hannity has also been quite 22 vocal about Islam and in a very negative way; is that fair? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 24 MS. MORENO: And so I guess my obvious question to 25 you is how does that impact your view?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think it impacts it at
 1
 2
           I listen to talk radio, and conservative hosts pretty
 3
    much all that's on. I do have Sirius talk radio. I like to
 4
     listen to both sides of an opinion, so that's why I watch a
 5
     lot of CNN and I also watch Fox, but really radio-wise,
 6
     that's -- that's pretty much what's on in my car when I'm
 7
     driving. There's also a good mix of sports talk radio in
 8
     that too.
 9
               MS. MORENO: So when you hear Rush Limbaugh talk
    about Imam Obama, right, in referring to our president --
10
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Okay.
               MS. MORENO: -- and that he's a Muslim -- I mean
12
13
    you've heard him say things like that.
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have, yeah, and I think it's
     a pretty ridiculous statement.
15
16
               MS. MORENO: Right. You think that's ridiculous?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   I do.
18
               MS. MORENO: And his statements about Muslims in
     general and the Quran in general?
19
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I -- yeah, I disagree with that
21
    point of view --
22
              MS. MORENO: But you --
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- mostly. I agree with their
23
24
     point of view maybe from a more financial side of things and
25
     spending things, but socially and a lot of issues I'm very
```

```
1 opposite side of.
2 MS. MOR
```

MS. MORENO: Well, but I see you don't -- you didn't list Rachel Maddow in your listening choices or Jon Stewart or the regular liberal lineup.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, it's hard to find those on the radio. San Diego has a lot of conservative talk radio; that just happens to be the stations that I get.

MS. MORENO: I guess what I need to know, sir, if you were sitting at that table and a juror, you, being -- and I think you've identified yourself as a Libertarian, a moderate, an independent -- but there was a potential juror who -- whose choices of listening reflected very poorly on your faith, let's say, how could we be comfortable with that? I mean what -- do you understand what I'm asking?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I understand what you're asking. I mean the perception would be out there; I admit to that. But I don't know what else I can say. I'm very -- I think I'm well-rounded with the media outlets that I look at. I do occasionally look at -- watch Rachel Maddow on MSNBC, but I'd say I lean more to the right, so that's primarily why I more gravitated towards the -- those stations.

MS. MORENO: Why do you think you would be a good juror in this kind of a case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I'm incredibly impartial because I do listen to both sides of every

```
argument, I never take anything at face value. That's why I
 1
 2
     listen to such -- I do listen to a wide variety of stations.
 3
               MS. MORENO: And is there some life experiences
 4
    that have formed your opinion that you're -- you listen to
 5
    both sides?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's just kind of who I've
 7
    always been. I don't know. I've always tried to hear both
 8
    sides of a story.
 9
               MS. MORENO: Okay. What do you -- what's your view
10
    on sharia law?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know enough about it to
11
    be honest with you. When I hear things about implementing
12
13
     sharia in the United States, I think we have a constitution,
14
    and that's what we should go by. But outside of the United
15
    States I don't have an opinion.
16
               MS. MORENO: Okay. And do you know anything about
17
    sharia law?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know much at all, no.
19
               MS. MORENO: Okay. And so if the government, if
20
     the prosecutor in this case mentions discusses brings
21
     evidence of sharia into this case, what kind of an effect
22
    would that have on you?
23
               THE COURT: Well, I hope you're not asking him to
24
    prejudge the --
25
              MS. MORENO: No, your Honor.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Like I said, I don't really
 1
 2
    have much -- I don't know many facts of sharia law, so I
 3
    would just have to take the evidence, what's presented to me
 4
    and go off that.
 5
               MS. MORENO: Okay. Is there anything else we
 6
    should know about you, Mr. Breier, that would be helpful --
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That will --
              MS. MORENO: -- in assisting us in making a fair
 8
    determination for our clients?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't -- I don't know.
10
    can't think of anything, no.
11
12
               MS. MORENO: Okay. Thank you. Sorry. I'm getting
13
    miked up. Ms. Stahl, Elizabeth -- there you are. Hi.
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hello.
15
              MS. MORENO: I just want to ask you a few
16
     questions. In your answers I think you self-identified as a
17
     Christian conservative; is that fair?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
19
              MS. MORENO: Would that be fair?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Conservative.
21
              MS. MORENO: I think you checked the --
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Christian, I checked Christian
23
    conservative.
24
               MS. MORENO: And why did you do that?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Because I'm a Christian --
```

```
MS. MORENO: Okay.
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- And I'm a conservative.
 3
              MS. MORENO: Okay. I mean how obvious is that,
 4
            I guess what I -- what we need to know is you also
 5
     talked about the places where you get your news --
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 6
 7
              MS. MORENO: -- and the only place that you
 8
    indicated was Fox News.
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband watches that all the
10
    time, so that's what I watch.
11
              MS. MORENO: Okay. And then you were asked what
12
    station and shows do you listen to, and you indicated Bill
13
    O'Reilly.
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband.
15
              MS. MORENO: All right. Well, what do you watch?
16
    That's what we need to know.
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I watch -- we don't really
18
    watch much TV.
19
              MS. MORENO: Okay.
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But I like The Closer --
              MS. MORENO: Me too.
21
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- until she left.
23
               THE COURT: Well, we're not asking for general --
24
               MS. MORENO: Right.
25
               THE COURT: -- Television here or entertainment. I
```

```
think the question --
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I like criminals or murders or
 3
    detectives.
 4
               MS. MORENO: Okay. You indicated that you had had
 5
    personal contact with Muslims; you said in school.
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was a travel agent school.
 7
    I don't really know if she was Muslim. She was from
 8
    Afghanistan, so I don't know, Muslim, Afghanistan, and she
    wasn't in my class.
 9
10
               MS. MORENO: All right.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And I also forgot -- I think I
11
12
    had a neighbor, but he moved --
13
               MS. MORENO: Okay.
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But we weren't -- just hi.
              MS. MORENO: Did she cover?
15
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Excuse me?
17
               MS. MORENO: Do you know if --
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, the husband -- it was the
19
    husband. Oh, in my travel agent class?
20
               MS. MORENO: Yes, ma'am.
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, she did.
22
               MS. MORENO: All right. Do you have any particular
23
    view of -- you may see in this case -- if you're picked to
24
    sit on this jury, you may see in this case either witnesses
25
     or audience members, females, who dress modestly and cover
```

```
wearing a head scarf. Would that affect your view of your
 1
 2
     ability to be fair and impartial in this case?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all.
 4
              MS. MORENO: What kind of reaction would you have
 5
     to that?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: To affect me?
 7
              MS. MORENO: Uh-huh.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If they didn't have anything on
 8
 9
    or something.
              MS. MORENO: If they were naked. Help me. Okay.
10
               THE COURT: You know what they say: The hole's
11
    pretty deep, and you have the shovel in your hand.
12
13
               MS. MORENO: Moving on. All right. Ms. Smith,
14
    Susan Smith. Hi. How are you?
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm good.
16
              MS. MORENO: All right. So I need to go back to
17
    one of the answers that you wrote in the questionnaire. And
18
     I hope you can appreciate that I'm not --
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.
20
              MS. MORENO: Berating it. Is it all right if I ask
21
    you about that?
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, absolutely.
              MS. MORENO: Okay. So you were asked what's your
23
24
    view of the Muslim or Islamic faith, and you wrote "Concerns
25
    about killing in the name of their god." And then you were
```

asked "How did you come to that view?" And you said "Life."

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.

MS. MORENO: So what did you mean? What life experience has brought you --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, right. Sorry. Go ahead.
MS. MORENO: No, no.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not my life, just when the -his Honor was asking, it has to do with the news that is
broadcast, that there are so many times when there is a
terrorist attack on some place that it turns out or the news
reports that it has been -- had something to do with the name
of Mohammad. I'm not -- I don't know the religion, and as I
stated earlier, I'm not a religious person, but doing
something that I would consider most of the world thinking is
a bad thing in the name of a god, whatever that god is,
doesn't make sense to me.

MS. MORENO: Thank you for that answer. Do you have an opinion or a view or is it your impression that

Muslims have a different god than Christians? And I ask you this because you wrote "their god," so that's why I'm asking.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And, honest, I don't know because, again, I'm not -- I'm not a religious person, so I don't know -- I hear -- and, again, this is just what I hear -- is that their god is Mohammad, and I don't even know if that's Muslim or if that's a different religion, to be

```
honest. And so they're calling -- they've got a name for
 1
 2
     their god as compared to god that is more recognizable in
    regards to the Christian religion.
 3
 4
               MS. MORENO: Okay. Let me just switch gears a
 5
    little bit and just ask you about your answer regarding
 6
    believing a law enforcement officer over other witnesses.
 7
    You answered "No," and then you said "Depends on
    circumstances. I would hope every law enforcement officer's
 8
    honest, but can't say I always believe them." So is it fair
 9
    to say from that answer that you don't automatically believe
10
    a law enforcement officer over any other -- any other
11
12
    witness?
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I -- again, it would
14
     depend -- I mean it would depend on what they're answering
15
     the question to. If they -- I would think that they're as
16
    honest as anybody else, and I would think that anybody else
17
    up there that's sworn to tell the truth is telling the truth.
18
    But I don't think one is more prominently honest than the
     other. I think --
19
20
              MS. MORENO: Okay.
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- they're all the same.
22
              MS. MORENO: Okay. All right. Thank you. Juror
23
    number 8, Lupe Flores. Hi. I wanted to explore a couple of
24
     your answers --
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

MS. MORENO: -- on this same question that I've 1 2 been asking others about. You were asked, "Is there anything 3 about Islamic teachings or doctrine that you're aware of that 4 is personally offensive to you" --5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. 6 MS. MORENO: -- and you said "Yes." And then you 7 wrote "Not really personally because I know there are I believe that they have a right to their faith 8 extremists. and beliefs, but harming anyone is offensive, whatever." 9 That doesn't explain so well --10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That was --12 MS. MORENO: Okay. So you were working your way 13 through it, right? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: When I answered -- wait a 15 minute. Let me answer you. Is it -- me personally --16 offensive to me. And as I said in the other questions, I 17 believe that -- I mean I know that all religions have harmed, 18 have -- so -- and it was really a tough one and it was also tough -- really tough for me to on the spot formulate an 19 20 answer and express it with clarity. MS. MORENO: You indicated on -- again, about if 21 22 you believe that Muslims generally support terrorist acts 23 carried out in the name of their religion, you didn't say yes 24 or no, but what you said was "Not generally, but some do."

25

What did you mean by that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. Well, I think that there are small groups that do, and I've lived long enough to know that -- you know, I remember when I would hear the same sorts of things in the news about Protestants and Catholics in Ireland and England, and so I think just like there's small factions there that I've heard the same things in the news currently and more recently in -- not -- as I say, not as a general, not as a whole.

MS. MORENO: So I guess what we need to know, now that you've heard the indictment that his Honor read yesterday and you know that the gentleman at the table are all Muslim and they're being charged in various counts with terrorism-related charges, and given what is widely shared -- many people have similar impressions -- tell us about your ability to be fair and impartial in this kind of a case.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I don't think that their religion has anything to do with what the charges are and those being proven. I mean it's did this criteria -- was this criteria met --

MS. MORENO: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- or not is what I'm going to be answering to, not the fact that they're Muslim and the criteria -- I mean that's not going to be weighed.

MS. MORENO: Okay. All right. Thank you so much. Juror number 29, Michael Crowell. Hi. So I like this

question 4 because it asks jurors to choose who they identify 1 2 with politically, and you put moderate and you put traditional conservatives. One juror put all of them, which 3 4 I'm still trying to get through, but --5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think on certain issues I'm 6 more of a moderate, and then on probably more of a business and finance, it's more of a conservative. 7 MS. MORENO: Okay. I think in your response to his 8 9 Honor's colloquy earlier -- and he was touching upon some of these issues -- I think you talked about family, religion, 10 and culture; do you remember that answer? 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 13 MS. MORENO: What -- can you expand on that a 14 little bit for us? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, just some of the, you 15 16 know, things I've read about it, it's more the -- it's more 17 of a cultural thing probably than a religion, but typically 18 your family is number 1, and then your village or perhaps but 19 definitely your country is sort of your last, you know, 20 belief that you're -- you hold your beliefs last to your 21 country. 22 MS. MORENO: Are you talking about in the context 23 of a person who is Muslim?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Or people that come from that

culture. Muslim is more prominent.

24

```
MS. MORENO: I'm sorry. From like Somali or
 1
 2
    African culture; is that what --
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 4
               MS. MORENO: And I think his Honor asked you if
 5
    given your answers, what you wrote, if any of that would
 6
     impact your ability to be fair and impartial, and I think you
 7
    said that you didn't believe so; is that fair?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's fair, yes.
 9
               MS. MORENO: I mean is there any hesitation in your
10
    mind; do you have any --
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I think I just have a --
    hopefully a better understanding of what some of the cultural
12
13
     issues are there.
14
               MS. MORENO: You have a better understanding?
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I do.
16
               MS. MORENO: And tell us why.
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just from reading the news,
18
    keeping abreast of issues, that type of thing.
19
               MS. MORENO: And with that understanding, is there
20
    anything that we should -- we, the defense -- should be
21
     concerned about or should know with the opinions that you
22
    hold now after -- after of a reading and --
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't believe so, but that's
24
    my opinion.
25
               MS. MORENO: No, and it's only your opinion that
```

matters because only you can tell us how you really think and feel. All right. Thank you, sir. Juror number 36, Monica Clark.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MORENO: Hi. I think his -- when his Honor was talking to you, he asked you the question about your answer to the question about law enforcement officers.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MS. MORENO: And I was listening very intently to your answer, and I think what you said was -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- they do tell the truth, the witness takes the oath to tell the truth, and they tell their truth; do you remember?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not quite -- what I meant is when you are sworn in, you are obligated, you're supposed to tell the truth.

MS. MORENO: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's at least what our system is based on. I don't think that policemen tell a better truth or anything like that or more truthful or whatever.

MS. MORENO: Okay. So can you accept the scenario that perhaps a law enforcement officer, an FBI agent, can get on the stand, take the oath to tell the truth and not do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's why I said I don't think

```
they tell a better truth or more truth. I just think that
 1
 2
     they are supposed to, they are sworn to tell the truth.
 3
               MS. MORENO: Right. Would you have any problems
 4
    judging the credibility of an FBI agent or a law enforcement
 5
     officer -- I mean and if you felt they were lying --
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, that's our -- I think
 7
    that's what we are supposed to be doing.
               MS. MORENO: Okay. And do you have any hesitation
 8
 9
    or any problems with about that?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, ma'am.
              MS. MORENO: Okay. Is there anything else that we
11
12
     should know about you with respect to the questions that I've
13
    been asking other jurors?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, ma'am.
15
              MS. MORENO: Okay.
                                   Thank you. Juror number 30,
16
    Roger Brenzel. Hi, Mr. Brenzel. You had prior jury
17
     experience; is that right?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I was on one trial.
19
              MS. MORENO: Sorry?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was actually on two trials.
     I don't remember the first one I was on; I was an alternate,
21
22
    wasn't part of the jury deliberation.
23
               MS. MORENO: You weren't part of the deliberation?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
25
              MS. MORENO: Do you remember what kind of case that
```

was? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was so long ago, I don't 3 remember. 4 MS. MORENO: And the second trial? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What kind of case it was? 6 MS. MORENO: Yes. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It had to do with an inmate 8 that had died at one of the detention facilities, local ones, and they were trying to prove that the sheriffs either 9 contributed to it or killed him or whatever, and they 10 11 couldn't prove it. I'm not -- we didn't see it, the jury 12 didn't. MS. MORENO: Okay. Was there anything about that 13 14 experience that is now inspiring you to serve yet again on 15 another trial or do you want to run out of here? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A little bit of both. 17 MS. MORENO: Thank you. I appreciate -- I 18 appreciate the answer. Tell us about that. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What, about running out or 20 staying? I find it interesting, but I'm not a very social 21 person, and it's just -- I'm kind of an introvert. 22 MS. MORENO: All right. But the principle -- that 23 brings up an interesting point. If you're picked on a jury, 24 you understand that part of your duties would be to

25

deliberate with other jurors?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 1
 2
              MS. MORENO: And my sense is now you've done that
 3
    once already; is that right?
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, we did.
              MS. MORENO: Okay. And you could do that easily --
 5
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, yes.
 7
              MS. MORENO: -- correct?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
              MS. MORENO: Is there anything else we should know
 9
    about you?
10
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think so, no.
12
              MS. MORENO: -- that my client, any of these
13
     gentlemen, should know about you, sir?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
15
              MS. MORENO: Do you think you can be fair and
16
     impartial?
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
              MS. MORENO: Is there any question in your mind?
18
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
20
              MS. MORENO: Thank you. Alice Young. Sorry to be
21
    skipping around. Hi. Okay. How are you?
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good. How are you?
23
              MS. MORENO: I'm good. I have my microphone and
24
    I'm all right. You answered a particular -- I'm going to ask
25
     you about some of your answers in the questionnaire. You
```

were asked if you knew any of the trial participants in this 1 2 case, and names were listed, and you said if I have, I've 3 forgotten. So I don't think you know or have remembered --4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I do not. 5 MS. MORENO: -- any media about this case; is that 6 correct? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 8 MS. MORENO: Is that correct? I'm sorry. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 10 MS. MORENO: Okay. And then you were asked if you saw, read, or heard anything about this case, what was your 11 personal reaction to it, and you indicated "Very sad to see 12 13 these things happening in our country." Do you remember 14 writing that? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. What was the question 16 again? 17 MS. MORENO: I'll restate it. You were asked if 18 you saw, read, or heard anything about this case, what was 19 your personal reaction to it -- that was the question -- and 20 you wrote "Very sad to see these things happening in our 21 country." 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. 23 MS. MORENO: Okay. So the question was asking you 24 about this case, and you talked about these things happening

in our country which make you sad.

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.
 1
 2
              MS. MORENO: So what were you --
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Which is what you hear on the
 4
    news.
 5
               MS. MORENO: Okay. And what things do you hear on
 6
    the news that you're referring to?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, just all the killings
 8
     going on, you know, around the country, and, you know, like
 9
     9-11, those type of things.
10
               MS. MORENO: Okay. Is there -- do you -- when you
    brought up 9-11 just now, was there a -- besides how it
11
12
     affected all of us --
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
14
              MS. MORENO: -- in this country, was there another
15
    more personal connection --
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
              MS. MORENO: -- that you had to it?
17
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
19
              MS. MORENO: Okay. And do you know any Muslims?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
21
              MS. MORENO: What have you been thinking -- sitting
22
    here and listening to the indictment and these charges and
23
     al-Qaeda references that may come in, sharia law, terrorism,
24
     al-Shabaab, what have you been thinking?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, you know, like I said, I
```

```
hate to see these things happening, you know, to our country,
 1
 2
    but I think I can, you know, be honest.
 3
               MS. MORENO: Okay. And there's no doubt; remember,
 4
     there's no right or wrong answers --
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
 6
              MS. MORENO: -- it's just, as you say, just being
 7
    honest?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.
 9
               MS. MORENO: But I guess what we need to know is in
     this case we're not talking about 9-11.
10
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I know that. I know that.
12
               MS. MORENO: Okay. Is there something about though
     this case that troubles you in a sense just hearing the
13
14
     charges in the indictment?
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, maybe it does.
16
              MS. MORENO: Okay. I really I know how hard this
17
    is; it's very hard --
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
19
              MS. MORENO: And jurors are so courageous. So
20
     please share with us what you're thinking.
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I would hope that I could
22
    be -- listen to both sides of the story and, you know, be
23
    fair.
24
               MS. MORENO: Okay. So -- and I'm sure his Honor
```

will so instruct, but in a criminal case, you may not hear,

quote, both sides of the story. 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. 3 MS. MORENO: So you may not hear anything from the defense because the burden of proof is only and always with 4 5 the government, okay? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. 7 MS. MORENO: Now, would that be difficult for you to accept because you'd want to hear what the defense has to 8 9 say? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. MS. MORENO: Okay. And lots of people feel that 11 way, all right, and I really appreciate you letting me talk 12 13 to you about this. But is it fair to say that if you didn't 14 hear anything from the defense, that that would be difficult 15 for you to put aside? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Probably. 17 MS. MORENO: Okay. And so jumping back a little 18 bit, with respect to the charges in the case and the things that you've heard referenced or alluded to, can you really 19 20 tell us that you could be completely fair and impartial in 21 this case? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, like I said, I hope that 23 I could, you know, because I mean I don't know them from

MS. MORENO: Of course. Of course. But you

24

25

Adam.

understand that in order to be able to sit --1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right, I understand. 3 MS. MORENO: -- you have to have an unequivocal 4 commitment to be fair and impartial. I quess what I'm 5 hearing -- and you tell me if I'm wrong -- you don't have 6 that kind of commitment? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I thought I did when I 8 came in to all this. 9 MS. MORENO: Okay. And I guess what I need to know is -- so your mind has changed now; would that be fair? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I guess so. MS. MORENO: I really appreciate your candor. 12 13 THE COURT: If you would hold on, counsel, for just 14 a moment. Ma'am, we don't -- we don't want you to feel 15 you've got to agree with counsel or disagree with counsel. 16 Her questions are important. Up until this particular point 17 in time, you've indicated that you can be fair and impartial, 18 that you can base your decision in this case on the evidence, 19 that you accept the constitutional principles I spent quite a 20 bit of time explaining to you and others. And so I don't 21 want -- if your -- if your mind has changed or upon further 22 reflection, listening to the questions of counsel, you have 23 some doubt as to whether you can be fair and impartial, you 24 have some doubt as to whether or not you can set aside some

of those -- some of those feelings that you might have that

```
were reflected in a few of the responses to the
 1
 2
     questionnaire, then you should tell us. But don't feel you
 3
    need to agree with counsel just because of the way she's
 4
     framing questions or just because of the way the government
 5
    may be framing questions at a later point in time. You need
 6
    to kind of dig down deeply right now and give us your final
 7
     feeling, your decision as to whether you can be fair and
 8
     impartial based on what you -- based on what you've been
     instructed, based on your -- how you know yourself to be,
 9
10
    based on everything you've heard in the courtroom.
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I think I could be fair
12
     and impartial.
13
               THE COURT: Well, Ms. Moreno's going to -- not
14
     going to be happy, particularly with that last answer, and
     she's going to think well, wait a minute, that you're
15
16
     agreeing with whoever --
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I could.
18
               THE COURT: -- that you're agreeing with whoever
19
    happens to be speaking --
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
21
               THE COURT: -- at the time. But I don't want -- I
22
     don't want you to feel -- I don't want anyone to feel that
23
     they're being led down a primrose path by anybody here, by me
```

or any of the attorneys that may be talking to you.

important stuff. It's important to both sides. Everybody is

24

entitled to have a fair trial and get a fair shake in terms of the consideration of the evidence and all of that. So if you're having doubts now about your ability to be completely fair and impartial, tell us. It's your duty to tell us. If you're -- if you're ready to make a commitment to be fair and impartial, tell us; if you have any doubt about your ability to fairly sit on the case, tell us that and then we won't take up any more of your time at this point.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I'm not sure now, so -
THE COURT: You're just thoroughly confused at this
point?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm confused.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to -- I'm going to excuse you, Ms. Young. I think it's unfortunate the way that -- the way that some of this went for you if in fact you felt an obligation to agree with anyone here. But if you feel in your heart of hearts that this is not an appropriate case for you, you can't be fair and impartial because of what's happened in the country -- sad things have happened in the country that you made reference to -- then this is not a good case for to you sit on.

I'll excuse you for cause. I'll ask that you just put the microphone down there on the seat. We'll call somebody else. We have other jurors. We'll call somebody else, and then we'll continue on. And I want to thank you

for your time and service. If you could go back to the jury lounge, they'll have further information about your immediate future. But I'm going to ask you to go back there. Okay. I believe Mr. Rodriguez is next, Gaby.

THE CLERK: Ryan Rodriguez.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Rodriguez. If you'd take a seat there. Ms. Moreno, I'm just going to take

you'd take a seat there. Ms. Moreno, I'm just going to take a minute here, so you can remain right there where you are. I know you've got very limited time now, and I'm going to ask Mr. Rodriguez just a few things here. Mr. Rodriguez, have you heard all of my instructions and the questions that I and counsel have asked so far?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Can you be and fair and impartial if selected on this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Have any doubt about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. You've heard the areas of concern that I've certainly emphasized, the areas of constitutional and the presumption of innocence and all of the all of the rights that emanate out from that presumption of innocence, including a defendant in a criminal case has an absolute right to decide not to testify and that that can never be construed negatively against a defendant. You know

```
what some of the -- some of the issues are that we've
 1
 2
     discussed. We've talked about the ability of jurors to
 3
    assess the believability, the credibility, of witnesses by
 4
     the same standards they would use for all other witnesses,
 5
     that no one should take the stand with a leg up simply
 6
    because of the position they hold, whether in law enforcement
 7
    or not, expert witness or not, someone affiliated with one
 8
    side of the case or the other. Can you apply those
 9
    principles as well?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I can.
               THE COURT: Okay. I'm just going to go through --
11
12
     I'm going to go through your questionnaire here. You
13
     indicated that you've been with the Auto Club, and a question
14
     I had was for how long.
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Six years.
16
               THE COURT: And has it always been in adjusting
17
     claims, sir?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. And before that?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was in college, food server.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. In connection with that matter
22
    in 1995, did you feel as though you were fairly handled by
23
    the justice system?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
25
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ms. Moreno, if you'd
```

```
please continue. And the time really is limited for you at
 1
 2
    this point. Thank you.
 3
               MS. MORENO: Thank you, sir. Mr. Rodriguez, let me
 4
    just quickly -- I have one question for you --
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
 6
               MS. MORENO: -- with respect to an answer you gave
 7
    on your questionnaire regarding whether you would believe law
 8
    enforcement over other witnesses -- and I'm sure you've been
     listening to the answers -- and you said -- you said "No,"
 9
    you said "No," and then you said "There are always two sides
10
11
    to every story. I like to hear and see people as they
    explain themselves." Okay. So remember the discussion I was
12
13
     asking a few minutes ago about the fact that in a criminal
     case the burden sits with the government --
14
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
16
              MS. MORENO: -- and the defense has no obligation
17
    to tell any story, right? What do you think about that?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I understand that. I
19
    understand the judicial system.
20
               MS. MORENO: Okay. How is it that you understand
21
    the judicial system? Do you have prior jury experience?
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I've taken some criminal
23
     classes through my college education.
24
               MS. MORENO: Okay. To be what, a defense lawyer?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not to be on the legal
```

```
side. More towards just to learn about the criminalistics,
 1
 2
     criminal law --
 3
              MS. MORENO: Okay. All right.
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- not a lawyer.
 5
               MS. MORENO: So when you -- just so I'm clear on
 6
    your position on the obligation of the government -- don't
 7
     give it back yet. Oh, it doesn't work? Okay. Sorry. I can
 8
    hear you. Can you hear me?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
10
               MS. MORENO: Would it be difficult for you to
11
    accept -- if you're picked as a juror and you hear nothing
    from the defense -- no evidence, no witnesses, nothing -- you
12
13
    hear only from the government, would it be difficult for you
14
    to accept that the defense doesn't have to tell you anything
15
    or produce any evidence or any witnesses?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all.
17
              MS. MORENO: It's counterintuitive though, isn't
18
     it?
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   No.
20
              MS. MORENO: So you have no problems with that?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all.
22
              MS. MORENO: Just have a couple more, your Honor.
23
               THE COURT: Okay.
24
               MS. MORENO: Cody (sic) Buckner, juror number 17?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Corey.
```

```
MS. MORENO: Corey. I'm so sorry, sir. Hi. You
 1
 2
    had indicated in the questionnaire that you had -- it asks,
 3
     "Have you had personal contact with people who are Muslims or
     of Somali descent," and you said "Yes." And then you -- and
 4
 5
     then you were asked "In what context?" And you said "In
 6
    place of worship." Do you remember?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I said in the
 8
    workplace.
 9
              MS. MORENO: May I show him his --
10
               THE COURT: Okay, sure.
11
              MS. MORENO: May I approach him, your Honor? Would
12
     you like to see your answer or would accept my
13
    representation?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I'm not sure what the
    question -- the answer to the question --
15
16
              MS. MORENO: All right. So I'll ask it again. You
17
    were asked "Have you had personal contact with people who are
18
    Muslims or of Somali descent?" And you said "Yes."
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
20
              MS. MORENO: And then it says "If yes, in what
21
     context?" And you were given a number of choices: In the
    family, in the neighborhood, in organizations, through work
22
23
    business, in place of worship, in school, and other. And you
24
    checked "In place of worship."
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, that was probably a
```

```
mistake. I meant in the workplace.
 1
 2
              MS. MORENO: Okay. Oh, you meant in the workplace?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 4
              MS. MORENO: Okay. Can you -- can you expand on
 5
     that?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. One of the ladies that's
 7
    in human resources is from Turkey, and she and I work closely
 8
     together.
              MS. MORENO: You work closely with her?
 9
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
              MS. MORENO: Okay. And is she Muslim?
11
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe she is, yes.
13
              MS. MORENO: Does she cover?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, she does not.
15
              MS. MORENO: Okay. All right. Is there anything
16
     about that experience that would affect your ability to be
17
     fair and impartial?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: None whatsoever.
19
              MS. MORENO: All right. What is -- what is Rod and
20
    Gun Club?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: South Bay Rod and Gun Club?
21
22
    It's a shooting range down in Dulzura.
23
              MS. MORENO: Just a quick moment, your Honor. Oh,
24
     you also -- we asked if you've had any training or taken any
25
     courses or seminars, and you checked "Religion." What can
```

```
you tell us about that?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, in our church we have
 3
    Bible studies.
 4
               MS. MORENO: Okay. All right. So that's what you
 5
    were referring to?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes.
 7
               MS. MORENO: Thank you. Juror number 11, Ron Meza.
 8
    No?
         Am I wrong?
 9
               MS. FONTIER: Rosa Meza.
10
               MS. MORENO: Rosa Meza. I'm so sorry. So sorry.
    Ms. Meza, in your questionnaire you were asked if -- "Do you
11
    have an opinion whether Muslims are more violent than
12
    non-Muslims," and you checked both yes and no, and then you
13
14
    wrote, "Not necessary more violent but consequences of their
15
    belief." Can you just expand on that for us.
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think what I meant there,
17
    it's not personally not all of them, some of them have belief
18
    because of their religion, but it doesn't mean that all of
19
     them. I think it's, you know, what happens, it's like a
20
     consequence of what they believe. I mean they have a reason
21
     they have -- they do it because of something their god or
22
    whatever, so it's a consequence of their beliefs.
23
               MS. MORENO: I'm just trying to understand what you
24
    mean by that.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, me too. I don't think

```
because they're Muslim they're violent. I think it would be
 1
 2
     like any other religion, any other ethnicity. They have
 3
     their beliefs or their customs or whatever that makes them do
     things but not because the person. I don't know if you know
 4
 5
    what I mean.
 6
              MS. MORENO: Okay. All right. I appreciate your
 7
    answer. I just -- one final question. You asked if you had
 8
    personal contact with Muslims, and you said "No," and then
    you checked "In school."
 9
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
11
              MS. MORENO: Do you --
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
13
              MS. MORENO: Have you had any contact --
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In college.
15
              MS. MORENO: -- or experience with Muslims or
16
     Somalis?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think he was Muslim. He was
18
    a student. We went to school together, but he was a class
     that we have, a business class.
19
20
               MS. MORENO: Thank you. Thank you so much. May I
21
    have a brief moment, your Honor, very brief? I want to thank
22
    the panel members very much. Very difficult. We really
23
     appreciate your candor. This is very important.
               THE COURT: Ms. Moreno, would you hold up just a
24
```

moment?

1 MS. MORENO: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Ms. Meza, I was a little confused by 3 one of your more recent answers to a question posed by Ms. 4 Moreno. I don't know if you said this or not. Did you say 5 that Muslims are violent or all Muslims are violent? It's a 6 part --7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 8 THE COURT: Okay. I may have missed the few words you might have said, to say all Muslims are violent and then 9 10 you proceeded with the answer, and I think you tried to 11 say --12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Maybe I said it as a negative 13 or a positive, I don't know. 14 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 16 THE COURT: Just tell me what your views are on 17 that once again. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I even got myself confused with the answer that I gave. I don't think they're 19 20 more violent than anybody else. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That was the question? 23 THE COURT: Yeah, that's the question I'm asking 24 you about, yeah. Then I just misinterpreted what you said. 25 You were equating them to other people, other religions. You

were saying they're similar, not all people are violent in 1 2 one religion or another religion; is that what you were --3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, since -- the question was 4 confusing because it was specifically to Muslims. 5 MS. MORENO: Yes. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So it's not that I think 7 they're violent, but what we see on TV and what the news and 8 all that, it happens to be like terrorists. It's not because they're Muslim. I mean it's not because they're violent, 9 10 maybe because their religion. 11 MS. MORENO: Okay. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's a consequence of what 13 there --14 THE COURT: would it be fair to say --15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's not the person. 16 THE COURT: Would it be fair to say -- I think what 17 you're saying is what you see on TV in some of these 18 instances, they're extremists --19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 20 THE COURT: -- and they're acting in ways that are 21 violent and terrible and perhaps in other ways, but it's not 2.2 a function, it's not the result of what their religion is, 23 they are extremists who happened to be Muslim rather than 24 they're doing what they're doing because they're Muslim?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not violent because they're

```
Muslim but because of what we see on TV, which means yes.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Okay. What you see on TV, the images
 3
     of what you see on TV and evidence of terrorist acts, whether
 4
     they're here or in any part of the world, could they
 5
     influence you in any way in this case in your determination
 6
     of the evidence?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
 8
               THE COURT: Are you sure about that?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes.
10
               THE COURT: Are you prepared to give both sides a
11
     fair trial in this case?
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
13
               THE COURT: Can you --
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If you hear both sides.
15
               THE COURT: Well --
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If not, we'll deal with one.
17
               THE COURT: No, no, no. You don't need to hear
18
    both sides. You need to give both sides -- I mean the
19
     government's entitled to be fairly heard as well; the
20
     government's entitled to have their evidence fairly
2.1
     considered.
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes.
23
               THE COURT: The defense is entitled to take
24
    whatever evidence comes out in the course of the trial,
25
     whether it's all from the government, part from the
```

government, part from the defense -- even though they have no obligation to present evidence, the defense is entitled to have jurors fairly consider the evidence. Both sides are entitled to have jurors fairly consider the evidence in the case regardless of what side that evidence may come from. Do you feel you can do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Of course.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Mr. Ward, why don't we get started with you. Perhaps we can finish up with you before we take our afternoon recess.

MR. WARD: Thank you, your Honor. I'm not sure this is going to be any better, but I was going to try and do from the lectern. Is it okay if I push the microphone this way?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WARD: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for continuing to bear with us during this process. And what I'm going to do for the next maybe 10, 15 minutes is just ask you four general questions that it would be good if everybody could pay attention to, and then I might have some follow-up questions on those four general questions, and in a couple instances have a -- some follow-up questions to jurors on -- or prospective jurors -- from their questionnaires.

So let me get started with the general questions. And just to let you know, you've heard a lot about the FBI,

the Federal Bureau of Investigation, just during the process 1 2 of jury selection. Well, they're the federal agency that investigates federal crimes of terrorism, which is why 3 4 they're involved in this case. And what I need to know from each of you is whether or not you've had any experiences or 5 6 feelings, opinions, or impressions from whatever source it 7 might be about the way the FBI conducts terrorism 8 investigations that might make it difficult for you to be fair to either the government or to the defendants. So does 9 10 anybody have some strong feeling one way or the other about the FBI's involvement in terrorism cases? 11 12 (No verbal response.) 13 MR. WARD: Okay. This next question is just a little bit different than what was on your questionnaire, and 14 15 it just deals with anybody who's had training in the law. So 16 my question is have you, a family member, or even a close 17 friend had any kind of training in the law, law school or law 18 enforcement. Yes, ma'am. It's Ms. Freni. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband. 20 MR. WARD: Right. Okay. Thank you. And sure. 21 Yes, sir? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm an attorney. 23 MR. WARD: Right, that was -- and then we have a

25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My son.

question here, a response here.

```
MR. WARD: Right, we heard about that. And I'm
 1
 2
    sorry. That's right. Ms. Stahl.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My niece. She works in
 3
 4
     probation.
 5
               MR. WARD: Okay. Thank you.
 6
               THE REPORTER: I didn't hear that. I'm sorry.
              MR. WARD: Okay. Can you go ahead and --
 7
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My father-in-law.
 9
              MR. WARD: And that is Ms. Clark?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
11
               MR. WARD: -- juror number 36. Maybe I should
12
     rephrase this. Other than -- the question that we asked is a
13
     little bit broader than the question that was on the
14
    questionnaire so that you've already responded as to someone
15
    who's had training in the law -- for instance, you know,
16
    Ms. Freni's response -- then I don't need to hear further
17
    from you. With that amendment, Mr. Bilse, do you still have
18
    a yes answer?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I may not have put down that my
19
20
     old roommate became an officer.
21
               MR. WARD: A police officer?
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
23
              MR. WARD: With what agency?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Santa Barbara Sheriff.
25
              MR. WARD: Okay. Anything about that that would
```

affect your ability to be fair? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, no. 3 MR. WARD: Okay. To either side? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 5 MR. WARD: Okay. And right next to Mr. Bilse, Ms. 6 Farkas, with that amendment? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No change. MR. WARD: Okay. I apologize. I probably should 8 have narrowed the question. Okay. I want to ask a question 9 10 that's actually more about the logistics of the trial. 11 this case a lot of the evidence is going to be recordings of 12 telephone calls, and they're predominantly -- they are almost 13 entirely in Somali. And you'll have some aids; you'll have a 14 binder of transcripts, and we'll have -- we'll have a way of 15 projecting the transcript upon a screen so you can follow 16 along with an English translation. But knowing that, does 17 anybody believe that they would have difficulty either 18 reading the transcripts, okay, either in a binder in front of 19 them or on a monitor, or following along with that kind of 20 evidence? Sure. I'm sorry. That's Ms. Cleavenger, right? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 22 MR. WARD: Sure. Go ahead and tell me. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know. I -- it would be 24 hard for me to like know what -- what you guys are talking 25 about, so --

MR. WARD: Right. But if I were -- and maybe I 1 2 didn't make this clear. The audio will be in the foreign language; it will be in Somali. We will give you a 3 4 transcript of an English translation of the Somali, so you'll 5 be following along on a script either in a binder that you'll 6 have in front of you or on a monitor or screen with the 7 English. So do you still have some concerns about your 8 ability to follow along in the evidence knowing that you'll 9 have the English? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I think so because -- I 11 mean it's -- I still don't know about much stuff, so it's 12 hard for me to like translate stuff. 13 THE COURT: Well, I'm having a hard time 14 understanding what you're saying, Ms. Cleavenger. You won't 15 have to translate anything. The audio, what you'll hear, is 16 a conversation taking place in Somali, which I assume is a 17 language you do not understand. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: But at the same time -- is there a rolling transcript, Mr. Ward? Is there a -- this is a Sanctions-based program, is it not?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WARD: Yes, it would be, your Honor.

THE COURT: So you'll hear some sound, but you'll see the English on the screen that corresponds to the language that is -- the foreign language that you're hearing.

```
So you're basically not trying to decipher what the Somali
 1
 2
     language is saying, you're reading -- merely reading the
 3
    English translation of that. Now, the question for you is
 4
    would you have a difficult time -- would it be difficult or
 5
    impossible for you to do that?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah because some words are --
 7
    like I don't understand some of the words.
               THE COURT: Like what? What don't you think you'd
 8
    understand?
 9
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, like for the
11
    questionnaire, some of it was confusing to me.
12
               THE COURT: The what now?
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The questionnaire was -- some
14
     of it was really confusing to me.
15
               THE COURT: Okay. Can be a little bit more
16
    helpful? Would you like to see a copy of the questionnaire
17
     and you can tell us what was confusing to you; that might be
18
    helpful to you just so that we know this is perhaps not the
19
    kind of case for you. We can just elaborate a little bit.
20
    Here, Mr. Ward, this is a generic --
21
               MS. HAN: I got one, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: All right.
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, like some of the big
24
    words, I -- to me it's hard for me to like understand what
```

they are. That's just how I've been pretty much my whole

1 life.

2.2

THE COURT: Okay. Let me get your questionnaire out and see if I can -- counsel, just in the interest of time -- I've got yours now. Thank you. You've got some college education?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, some.

THE COURT: Okay. You are -- I assume you graduated high school.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And how much college did you take?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just one year.

THE COURT: Okay. You just took some general

courses?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Just so that I have a general idea so that I can make an informed decision, I'm going to have your own questionnaire, a copy of your own questionnaire shown to you, and if you could just indicate what questions or words you had difficulty with. I certainly don't want to embarrass you, but this would give me a better idea.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have -- I understood like most like all the questions. I just -- like big words and stuff that you're saying and stuff like that I -- like I don't understand some of them.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's just my --

THE COURT: Ms. Cleavenger, let me just kind of shift the conversation a little bit. I've been talking about some concepts during jury selection in this case like the presumption of innocence, those kinds of things. Have you been understanding what I've been talking about when I've --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, some of them, not -- like most of them I have but not all of them.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything in particular that I may have been talking about or Ms. Moreno may have been talking about that gave you difficulty like after a question or after a statement, you thought to yourself I don't have a clue as to what that means?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Some of them, yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ms. Cleavenger, what I'm going to do is I'm going to dismiss you from this trial. I very much appreciate your candor in this regard; it's important. I hope I didn't embarrass you; that certainly wasn't our purpose here.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: But if you feel that it would just present some kind of a problem for you to follow an English rolling script of corresponding Somali language that's being spoken, I don't want to make this too difficult for anyone, and it's important that we have a jury consisting of 12

```
people, not 11 -- or 11 people that understand and
 1
 2
     somebody --
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I understand.
 3
 4
               THE COURT: -- that's just not able to follow.
 5
    I'll ask that you return to the jury lounge at this point.
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Okay.
 7
               THE COURT: And the clerks over there will have
 8
     further information for you I'm sure. We very much
     appreciate your time and service. Thank you.
 9
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
11
               THE COURT: And if you'd stand down for just a
    moment, Mr. Ward, we're going to fill for Ms. Cleavenger.
12
13
    And I'm going to ask Ms. Ross to come forward. And good
14
    afternoon, Ms. Ross. Thank you for your patience. And I
15
    would first start by asking you whether or not you have heard
16
     all of my instructions thus far and the questions that I and
17
     the attorneys have raised.
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I've heard everything.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. Can you be a fair and impartial
20
     juror in this case?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I could be.
22
               THE COURT: But --
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You know, I look forward to
24
    hearing evidence. I'm kind of -- I think two -- just after
```

two days, it's -- I think it came up with a question about

1 the FBI.

THE COURT: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And I just wanted to say that while I took everything at face value 20 years ago, I recently actually started to question things that are happening in our government, and I've read a lot about it lately, and I just — this has just been coming into my mind after listening to everybody, and — so I wanted to be open about that and say I would really, really love to hear facts and evidence on all these issues.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's get a little bit more basic before we get into that one area that you just mentioned.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: You've been hearing the kinds of questions that I've been asking over the course of two days and Ms. Moreno asked for an hour. Hearing all of that, hearing the instructions, being advised of the basic principles in this case, the constitutional principles that apply, can you be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I believe I could be fair.

I'm a strict constitutionalist.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would say I'm a strict constitutionalist.

THE COURT: A strict constitutionalist. I don't 1 2 know what that means. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kind of. What is it? I quess 4 I've been -- recently my eyes have been opened about the 5 United States Constitution, and I believe strongly in freedom 6 of speech. 7 THE COURT: All right. Is there a particular event 8 that has opened your eyes? You seem to have had an epiphany lately. What is there that's happened that you feel has 9 shifted your thinking for you? Could you talk about it? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I'm trying to gather my thoughts. I think it's been the war. I've -- I guess that 12 13 could sum it up. If anyone knows the beliefs of Ron Paul, 14 I've been following a lot of his. THE COURT: So you consider yourself to be a 15 16 Libertarian, and that's reflected on your questionnaire. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. And I think -- I guess 18 it's just been a change in my attitude from how I felt 20 19 years ago. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And so I guess I've just 22 been -- I've kind of been concerned with if we're -- you 23 know, I don't believe we're hearing the truth about everything on the mainstream media. 24

25 THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So that's -- I guess that has been an epiphany to me perhaps four to eight years ago.

THE COURT: All right. Well, all of those things are fine. We've certainly been exposed to an awful lot in the media. We have all types of media espousing on all types of issues. You embrace the beliefs I think, as you phrase them, of Ron Paul. We know that he ran for the Republican nomination this last time around for president of the United States. We know he's a Libertarian. We knows he's against all foreign wars and foreign military activity the government is currently involved with.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: His position is end them now, bring all the troops home, close down all our military bases all over the world, and basically just get out of the way.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. That's all well and good.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: That doesn't disqualify you from being a member of this jury. What I want to know is whether or not you can set aside your political philosophy, your leanings, who you might embrace, whether you feel that our activity in the Middle East and in other places is just or unjust; can you decide this case having heard the charges based on the evidence and not be influenced by these other considerations?

If you feel you would be unduly influenced, that it would -it would incline you to favor one side or the other, then
this is not a proper case for you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't think I would favor one side over another.

THE COURT: Okay. I asked a lot of questions there. You don't think you'd favor one side or the other. Can you fairly consider the evidence, give both sides a fair shake in that regard?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I would look forward to doing that.

THE COURT: You feel that you can keep out all of these considerations that we've been -- you've been thinking about politically recently that have come to mind? Can you set those aside? This is not a case about them.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I think I could set them aside. I think it's been the whole process of trying to express who we are in this -- in this venue that it's made me think of all of these positions, you know.

THE COURT: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But I actually never -- don't really sit and think about it that often.

THE COURT: And we spent a good deal of time on the importance of being able to judge the believability of all witnesses who testify by the same standards, that no one

should take the stand here with a leg up in the mind of the jury, with the jury thinking this person is more inclined to tell the truth, is inherently more truthful than anyone else because of the job that individual has. The other side of that coin is that no one should feel that if somebody takes the stand, they're less likely to be truthful simply because of their position.

You'll be hearing from certain witnesses called by the government who are from governmental agencies, particularly the FBI. Would your recent feelings and thoughts concerning the politics that you've been referring to influence you in your ability when it comes to assessing the believability of witnesses?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think not. I don't really know anything about the FBI. I have heard negative things about the CIA, however, but I think that I would, you know, give everybody the right to speak, and then I would have to evaluate based on what I hear and, you know.

THE COURT: Would you follow the law in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, absolutely, yeah. I'm that type of person definitely.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there any reason you can think of why you should not be on this jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I can't.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Just going through your questionnaire
 3
    here briefly. Have you worked outside the home? I know
 4
     you're a homemaker at the present time, you had training in
 5
     computer science. Have you worked outside the home in the
 6
    past? I assume so.
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, before I had children, I
 8
    worked at IBM as an assistant systems engineer.
               THE COURT: Okay. Have you supervised other people
 9
10
    in the workplace?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. Well, only as a homemaker.
12
     I was always a coach in rec leagues and things, so I guess --
13
               THE COURT: Volleyball?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, and basketball.
15
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ms. Moreno, why
16
     don't you proceed if you have any particular questions --
17
               MS. MORENO: I do.
18
               THE COURT: -- for Ms. Ross.
19
              MS. MORENO: May it please the Court?
20
               THE COURT: Briefly, please.
21
              MS. MORENO: Hi. You were asked -- you were asked
2.2
    if there was anything about Islamic teachings or doctrine
23
     that was personally offensive to you, and you said "Yes."
24
     Then you said "I've heard people say that they want to kill
25
     the infidel. I've also heard that this is not true, so I
```

guess there have been many different forms of Islamic teaching."

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. You know, I think I misread the question because I don't -- I didn't pay attention to the "personally offensive" part.

MS. MORENO: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So I would say I made a mistake in saying yes because I'm not easily offended really by anything.

MS. MORENO: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You know, like I really don't know that much about Islam other than just what I've heard and, you know -- I mean I'm 53 years old and I read a lot. I've heard a lot of things.

MS. MORENO: You indicated that you were asked if you had personal contact with Muslims, and you didn't say yes or no, but then the next question is if yes, in what context, and you wrote -- you checked in "in school," and then you put "not sure," and then you checked "other," and you said "just out in public, i.e., airports." What did you mean by that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You know, I wanted to just be as truthful as possible, and I don't believe I know anyone personally Islamic, but I think I -- I know someone who's Persian, and then I think I assumed they were Islamic and later found out they were Christian.

And then as far as school, I rethought that. I had 1 2 a religious studies teacher, and I believe he was Indian or 3 Pakistani, so I don't know what his religious faith was. 4 MS. MORENO: Okay. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So I was just trying to think 6 of anything, in vain. 7 MS. MORENO: Well, I appreciate that. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do know -- also I know 8 someone who's from Egypt and I don't know their faith. I 9 don't know what it is. 10 11 MS. MORENO: Okay. You were asked if you followed any criminal cases involving allegations of terrorism or 12 13 support of terrorism, and you checked "no," and then you 14 wrote, "I have been wondering if we know the whole truth about 9-11." Do you want to expand on that? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What did I say no to? 17 MS. MORENO: I'm sorry. You were asked if you 18 followed any criminal cases involving allegations of 19 terrorism or support of terrorism; that was the question. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, I quess it would be yes, 21 right? The answer should have been yes? 22 MS. MORENO: Right. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I quess I didn't -- I'm not 24 sure what it means to follow a criminal case. I've just been 25 reading a lot of things in the past say four years just

because I've gotten -- gotten concerned with the war and --1 2 MS. MORENO: So let me ask you this. In answer to 3 his Honor's questions -- I was listening very intently, and 4 you said that -- that you looked -- you looked forward to 5 hearing both sides, and so I need to visit that with you for 6 a little because in a criminal case, it may well be that you 7 don't hear both sides, that you only hear the government's case because they have the burden of proof, okay? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. 9 10 MS. MORENO: And the law says that you cannot 11 consider the fact if the defense puts on no evidence, nobody testifies. Do you think you could do that? 12 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Do what? Consider what? 14 MS. MORENO: Do you think that you could not 15 consider the fact that the defense would not put on any 16 evidence as the law would require you to do. If you can't, 17 you can't. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I could do that, no problem. 19 20 MS. MORENO: You wouldn't have any problem? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. In fact, I didn't realize 22 that the law requires you to do that. I mean my only 23 experience has been on TV shows, you know, Perry Mason, where 24 the person who's guilty always get up and confesses to 25 everything, so --

THE COURT: Ms. Moreno, I'm going to ask that you 1 2 conclude this, and we'll get Mr. Ward back up and --3 MS. MORENO: Thank you. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Ward, would you please continue 5 with your examination. 6 MR. WARD: Let's see. I'm done with my general 7 questions, and I wanted to do follow-ups with three 8 prospective jurors. Juror number 15, it's Ms. Boggess, 9 right? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Boggess. 11 MR. WARD: Boggess, right. On your questionnaire 12 there was a response about serving on a -- previously on a 13 jury. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 15 MR. WARD: And what I wanted to ask you about that 16 was whether there was anything about that experience, 17 positive or negative, without telling me the result, that you 18 feel might affect your ability to judge this case fairly. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I didn't have any -- it 20 didn't finish, so I didn't have any positive or negative 21 feelings. 22 MR. WARD: Oh, I understand it didn't finish. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. So it barely had 24 started, so I didn't have any, you know -- I mean it was a 25 little disappointing that we went through all this and

nothing came of it. But I didn't have any positive or 1 2 negative feeling. 3 MR. WARD: Okay. So if I understand you correctly, 4 you did not deliberate. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We did not. 6 MR. WARD: Okay. Great. If we could pass the 7 microphone to juror number 24, Ms. Delaney, right? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. MR. WARD: So, Ms. Delaney, can you just tell us a 9 little bit about what you did at Planned Parenthood and how 10 11 long you were there. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I worked for ten years as an 13 assistant manager. And in the very beginning of my 14 employment there, I was a -- they had a different term, but 15 it was a medical assistant, and I progressed to an assistant 16 manager, management position. 17 MR. WARD: Okay. And besides that time, that job 18 at Planned Parenthood, who I understand you're not working 19 right now --20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. 21 MR. WARD: How were you employed before you went to 22 Planned Parenthood? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I worked for a place called 24 Epic Resorts, which was -- it had a travel arm; it was 25

selling and renting rental weeks at resort properties

1 timeshare.

2.2

MR. WARD: So I noticed on your educational background that you have an MS in clinical psychology?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. WARD: Do you ever do any graduate or -PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a master's degree in
clinical psychology.

MR. WARD: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I came out to California to do a Ph.D program but I did not complete that.

MR. WARD: Okay. Then did you go from the Ph.D program into the travel service?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, crisis of conscience. It was time to shift gears.

MR. WARD: And juror number 40, Ms. Fierro.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. WARD: Ms. Fierro, I apologize. Give me just a minute and I'll get caught up to the question in your questionnaire. Oh, on question -- the question number 51 -- this was the question about there may be evidence in the case consisting of tape-recorded telephone conversations using electronic devices, and your response was "I believe it would depend" -- the question was whether or not you can fairly consider that evidence along with the other evidence in the case, and your response is that I believe it would depend

1 upon the evidence presented at trial.

I think I know what that means, but can you explain to me a little bit more --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, my belief is not everything that's recorded is legal, so depending on the trial and what's presented to me is whether I'm going to decide whether one way or another.

MR. WARD: Okay. Well, if it was presented to you and the Court instructed you that it had been admitted as evidence, could you fairly consider that evidence along with any of the other evidence committed at trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would consider it as evidence, but then again I would have to sit with the jury to decide whether it was appropriate or not appropriate.

MR. WARD: Well, when you say appropriate or not appropriate, would you -- would you -- is there anything in particular about tape-recorded conversations that would give you trouble on fairly judging the case either for the government or the defendants?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, again, if it's done legally and you can prove that it was done legally and it comes forward that it's done legally, I would take it into consideration.

MR. WARD: Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Ward, let me step in here, please.

It's not the function of the jury to decide whether evidence that comes in in the form of recorded telephone calls is legal evidence. It's evidence. If it's coming in, if it's coming in, it's evidence to be duly considered by the jury. If it were not evidence, as you term it to be, legal evidence, then it would not be coming in.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

2.2

THE COURT: All right. Can you accept that principle? It's not the function of the jury to determine the legality of evidence in the form of wiretap intercepts or recorded conversations; that's the point I want to make with you at this time. And if you have any difficulty accepting that, then we need to know that. But if you can accept that principle and then fairly consider all the evidence in the case, giving what weight to the evidence you find is deserving, then that's basically what the responsibility of the jury is.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I believe I can do that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WARD: Your Honor, I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to take a break at this point. It's three o'clock, and I and the attorneys are going to spend some time discussing a few matters properly discussed outside your presence, so we're going to take a bit of an extended

```
recess at this time, and we're going to take it -- well, it's
 1
 2
     three o'clock now -- we're going to take it to at least 3:30
 3
     for your purposes, and we'll see you back here at 3:30.
 4
    Hopefully we can get you in at that time or as soon
 5
     thereafter as possible. Remember the admonition, and we will
 6
    see you shortly. Thank you.
 7
          (The jury left the courtroom.).
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. We are outside the
 9
    presence of all jurors. Any challenges for cause, Mr. Ward
    or Mr. Cole?
10
11
               MR. WARD: None from the government, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: Any challenges for cause from the
13
     defense?
14
               MS. MORENO: Yes, yes, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: All right, Ms. Moreno. Please.
16
               MS. MORENO: Your Honor, I believe with respect to
17
    juror number 2, Ms. Farkas, she never gave an unequivocal
18
     committal to being fair -- I'm trying to see my notes -- so
19
    she talked -- I mean, you know, your Honor --
20
               THE COURT: Her testimony is fresh in my mind, Ms.
21
    Moreno, so -- but make any record you'd like to make.
22
               MS. MORENO: All right. So I think she wasn't
23
    being candid, your Honor, and I think what she said in her
24
    questionnaire was a candid response and that was that, as she
25
     talked about -- I don't have the questionnaire --
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, I went in to this -- you're looking at 18 -- 17 and 18. She thinks most are good people, that they don't feel women are equal to men; 18 is that -- that was 17; 18, that they can be taught at an early age to hate and that anyone who doesn't agree with their doctrine is an infidel.

I spent quite a bit of time with her at least getting her to elaborate a little bit, and I think it was pretty clear after the time I spent with her that she wasn't referring to Muslims in general, that she was referring to those elements that preach hate, whether in a madrassa, whether they're proponents of Wahhabism, which she may or may not have heard of, but she agreed I think in general terms that that's what she had reference to. She indicated she had substantial contact with Muslims in different -- in different circumstances. And then I know you spent quite a bit of time with her and I know what you were anticipating you'd get from her, but I don't think you ever got it. I think she did make a commitment, and she made a commitment in one of two ways in my view looking at how she was expressing herself, her body language and all the rest of it. She said that she hoped that if she were in the shoes of -- in essence what she was saying is that if she were in the shoes of one of the defendants here, she would be judged by the same frame of mind she has. And then just as important was the fact that

frankly I think she became a little antagonistic at the end; she took umbrage with you.

MS. MORENO: Yes, she did.

THE COURT: And I think they took umbrage at your suggestion that she could not be fair, that this was not a firm commitment she was making. So I would deny your request to excuse Ms. Farkas for cause.

MS. MORENO: I would also just proffer for the record her answer to question number 27, that it would make it difficult for her to listen with an open mind and render a verdict in this case, in this case. And I believe she was not being candid with the Court. I agree with your Honor's perception that she got antagonistic, and so I would -- I would submit the cause challenge on her.

THE COURT: I think you're going to have to use one of your many peremptory challenges directed in her direction then, Ms. Moreno.

MR. DRATEL: Your Honor, may I have just one second about -- and I agree that she did take on her, but I thought it was because she was being asked to make a commitment, and it never got -- she never said yes, I can make an unequivocal commitment; she said well, I hope I can or I hope someone, if it were doing it for me, could do that, not that she was saying that she would be the right juror for this case. I think her resistance and her coming back with an answer that

said "if you know me better than I do" is not the same as 1 2 saying yes, I can unequivocally do it. She never got there. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Any further challenges, Ms. 4 Moreno? 5 MS. MORENO: Your Honor, with respect to Ms. Ross, 6 one of the last jurors --7 THE COURT: Yes. MS. MORENO: -- I wanted to inquire into her 8 9 answers on question 17; I did not have the ability to do so. 10 And this was where she answered the question about her view 11 of the Islamic faith, that she indicated -- first she said that all people are free to worship the God of their choice, 12 13 then she said that my faith does teach that they do not 14 follow the one true God that I believe in. This saddens me. 15 I believe that was an area that cause could have been 16 developed. 17 THE COURT: Well, okay. As I say, she answered my 18 questions. We went into the business that we've gone in with 19 so many of the jurors generally and individually about 20 credibility, and time does become a bit of a constraint here. 21 I think she satisfied me that she would be fair and 22 impartial. And if you're challenging her for cause, I'm 23 going to deny the request to remove her for cause. 24 MS. MORENO: Would the Court allow me to develop

25

the cause challenge on her?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT: I think you did. I mean I think you
questioned her, and I -- you know, we're at the point now
where we've got to get our -- select our jurors in this case.
Ms. Ross is a bit of a loose cannon on the deck; I'll give
you that. And it may be that if both sides want to stipulate
to remove her for cause, I'm happy to do that, but that --
what that's going to do is diminish slightly our chances of
getting three alternates, and it's going to reduce the number
of challenges, peremptory challenges, back to 7 and 12.
happy -- I'm happy to have both sides stipulate for her
removal, but it may have -- it may have some consequences
here. I'll try to impanel three juror -- three alternates,
but it may not be possible.
          MR. COLE: We're fine stipulating to removing her
for cause.
          THE COURT: Okay. I assume that's agreeable, Ms.
Moreno.
          MR. DURKIN: She's all right with me, Judge.
          MS. MORENO: He doesn't want to stipulate, so we're
not --
          MR. DURKIN: I like her. I mean I don't disagree
that she's a loose cannon on the deck of life, but --
          THE COURT: You like loose cannons.
          MR. DURKIN: I do. Been called one a few times.
          THE COURT: I'm sorry?
```

```
MR. DURKIN: I said I've been called one a few
 1
 2
     times.
 3
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
 4
               MS. MORENO: Okay.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Well, you know what?
 6
     don't think you need to worry about it.
 7
               MS. MORENO: Exactly.
                         In any event, any other challenges for
 8
               THE COURT:
 9
     cause, Ms. Moreno?
10
               MS. MORENO: No, your Honor. How long can we --
11
               THE COURT: Let's do this. Let's do this. Well,
12
     it shouldn't take a while. It's a deselection process. You
13
    know who you need to get off. I don't want to prolong this
14
    too long. I know that we're working under a little pressure
15
    because I do want to give Ms. Fontier an opportunity to get
16
    her rulings on deposition transcripts.
17
               MS. FONTIER: I would rather take as much time as
18
    Ms. Moreno needs.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. Let's do this --
20
              MS. FONTIER: We can deal with the depositions
21
    another time.
22
               THE COURT: It's time for a break. Let's take ten
23
    minutes, okay? That's going to get us back here at 20 after
24
    3:00. Let's get you that time -- if you don't want to take
```

all that time -- plus another 20 minutes. You got a half

```
hour to work on your strikes. Each side is going to get a
 1
 2
    strike sheet at this point. Identify your strikes. At this
 3
    point it's 8 and 13, okay, if you wish to, exercise that many
 4
    peremptory challenges. I'd like to get the jury back in here
 5
    about a quarter to 4:00. As soon as you're done with your
 6
    strikes, please let Gaby know. I'll come down, we'll
 7
    correlate your strikes. If there are any constitutional
 8
    questions we'll go over those, and then we'll bring the
 9
     entire panel back in, seat them in the back, and then call
10
     the first 12 unchallenged jurors as the jurors to be seated,
11
    and then two -- at least two, hopefully three alternates, and
     then we'll call it at that point. And then we'll swear them
12
13
     tomorrow, and hopefully we'll have some time for Ms. Fontier.
14
     Okay? Good.
15
               MS. FONTIER: Thank you, your Honor.
16
          (There was a break in the proceedings.)
17
               THE COURT: Do we have all counsel here? Ms.
18
    Moreno?
19
              MS. MORENO: Yes.
20
               THE COURT: Pursuant to your request, we have
21
     arranged to have audio transmitted from Courtroom 16 into
22
     Courtroom 15; I'm happy to report that.
23
               MS. MORENO: Thank you so much.
24
               THE COURT: And there will be 38 additional seats.
```

MS. MORENO: Great.

THE COURT: Members of the community, the Somali community, are welcome to be seated behind the bar in Courtroom 15 on a first come/first served basis. It would be nice if people would cooperate if there are more and they could rotate in and out. Of course, that would be in addition to seating, available seating, in Courtroom 16. There will be security in there. I will certainly appreciate any efforts that all of you can undertake to help maintain order and decorum in the halls always and to have distance, respectable distance, between the jurors in the case and supporters, as you have termed them yourself in the past. So that would be very helpful. And I think that's -- that's some news I wanted to give you.

MS. MORENO: We're very grateful, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. MORENO: We're emailing one of the leaders/liaison to the community right now. And I'm sure that they're going to be very, very grateful. And I'll try to personally speak to them, someone, sometime tonight.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Very good. Okay.

We're outside the presence of jurors. Looking at this strike sheets here. Okay. The first -- you have your copies as well I'm sure, counsel, so we can get started here.

The first 12 unchallenged jurors will comprise the jury here. Mr. Bilse is unchallenged; he will be juror

```
number 1. Farkas is challenged by the defense. The third
 1
 2
     juror, Mr. Wease, has been challenged by the defense.
 3
     fourth juror, Ms. Lee, has been challenged by the government.
 4
     The fifth juror, Mr. Rodriguez, has been challenged by the
 5
     defense. The sixth juror, Mr. Channell, is unchallenged and
 6
    shall be juror number 2. Please follow along with me,
 7
     counsel, because if I'm inaccurate here in any way, you can
 8
    let me know.
 9
               The seventh juror, Ms. Faith, is unchallenged by
10
    either party; she will be juror number 3. The eighth juror,
    Ms. Flores, is challenged by the defense. Ninth juror,
11
    Mr. Sciacqua, is unchallenged, and he will be juror number 4.
12
13
               The tenth juror is unchallenged, that is, Mr.
14
     Johnson; he'll be juror number 5. The 11th juror is
15
    unchallenged and will be -- that's Ms. Meza -- juror number
16
     6. Ms. Lopez is unchallenged by either side; she'll be juror
17
    number 7.
18
               You know, counsel, nobody mentioned it, but let me
19
    ask at this point. Are there any constitutional challenges
20
     to the strikes in this case by either side?
21
               MR. COLE: Not by the government, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: All right.
23
               MS. MORENO: Not for the defense, your Honor.
               THE COURT: All right. Continuing on, number 13,
24
```

Ms. Smith, has been challenged by the defense. Juror number

- 1 14, Ms. Salinas, has been challenged by the government.
 2 Juror number 15, Ms. Boggess, is unchallenged; she will be
 3 juror number 8.
 4 Juror 16, Mr. Breier, challenged by the defense.
 5 Juror number 17, Mr. Buckner, challenged by the defense.
- Juror number 18, Ms. Murguia, challenged by the defense.

 Juror number 19, Ms. Free, challenged by the government.

 Juror number 20, Mr. Bristow, challenged by the government.

 Juror number 21, Ms. Ross, challenged by the government and the government only.

Juror number 22, Ms. Freni, is unchallenged; she will be juror number 9. Juror number 23 challenged by the defense. Juror number 24 -- 23 is Mr. Todd. Juror number 24, Ms. Delaney, challenged -- unchallenged; juror number 10 she will become. Juror number 25, Miriam Hernandez, challenged by the defense. Juror number 26, Ms. Ramirez, unchallenged; she will be the 11th juror. Juror number 27, Ms. Fierro, unchallenged by either side; she'll be juror number 12. That is your jury.

And then juror 28, Ms. Stahl, challenged by the defense. Juror number 29, Mr. Crowell, challenged by the defense. Juror number 30, Mr. Brenzel, unchallenged; he will be alternate number 1.

Juror number 31, Ms. Dominguez, challenged by the government. Juror number 32, Mr. Merkin, challenged by the

```
government. Juror number 33, Ms. Evans -- excuse me --

Mr. Evans, challenged by the defense. Juror number 34,

Ms. Alise, challenged by the government. Juror number 35,

Mr. Adams, unchallenged; he will be alternate number 2.

Juror 36, Ms. Clark, unchallenged; alternate number 3.

So those are our jurors and our alternates. Are we in agreement, counsel, that it's a correct recitation of
```

MS. MORENO: Yes, your Honor.

MR. COLE: Yes, your Honor.

names?

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. What I would like to do at this point is to bring everyone in, have them seated in the back of the courtroom, and we will -- I will call the jurors to be seated in the box. And we'll put one extra seat up against the wall there, Gaby, near the jury deliberation room for the alternate juror once we're calling them and having them come forward, okay. Then I'll just -- I'll advise the individuals that they are the jurors selected for the case as well as the alternates. I'll give them -- I'll have them report back here at nine o'clock tomorrow for opening statements, give them a few further admonitions, and then that will be it; I'll let them go and have them report directly to Courtroom 16 tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. for preliminary instructions and opening statements. Anything further before we bring we bring these folks back in? Mr.

Cole? 1 2 MR. COLE: No. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Anyone from the defense? 3 4 Ms. Moreno? 5 MS. MORENO: Thank you. No, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. 7 (The prospective jurors entered the courtroom.) THE COURT: All right. First of all, ladies and 8 gentlemen, thank you for your patience. I'm just trying to 9 get a few loose ends tied up here. For those of you who left 10 personal items in the jury box -- and I think there are just 11 a few of you -- could you come forward, please, and secure 12 13 the personal items and then -- and then return to your seats. 14 I should have asked you to do that earlier. Sorry about 15 that. 16 All right. Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you 17 what we've been doing the last 45 minutes or so. Each side 18 is privileged to exercise a certain number of peremptory 19 challenges. I know that those of you with prior jury service 20 in all probability recall what that process is about. We 21 thought that would be better done outside your presence, and 22 so counsel were able to once again review all of the 23 information they've elicited in the form of the 24 questionnaires, your answers to interrogatories, your

backgrounds, and all the rest of it, and we've basically made

the decisions as to who will sit as jurors in this case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If you do not sit as a juror, if you are not impaneled in this case, please do not take that personally; please do not feel rejected in any way, shape, or form. attorneys in their wisdom and based on a limited amount of information made considered decisions as to who is appropriate to sit on the case. So that's pretty much it. Don't speculate or exercise conjecture as to why and wherefore most of you will not be sitting on the case because we only select 12 jurors and three alternates, and so I'm going to ask those individuals who will comprise the jury to come forward as I call names, and there will be three alternate jurors as well. I will tell you that alternates are very important. This case is expected to go something on the order of three weeks -- and you all know that, you've all been time-screened -- and we're coming through a pretty difficult season with the flu and other illness it seems, and so we always appreciate having alternate jurors. And of course alternates are here for all sessions of court, and I'll have more to say about that. But in any event, 15 names are going to be called at this time out of approximately 50 of you, and so these are the names. I'll ask you to come forward and take the seats that will be assigned to you.

Mr. Bilse, if you come forward, please, juror number 1, and once again take the first seat, the one that

you had occupied the entire day. Thank you. Juror number 2,

Mr. Channell, please come forward. Juror number 3, Ms.

Faith. Juror number 4, Mr. Sciacqua. Juror number 5, Mr.

Johnson. Juror number 6, Ms. Meza. Juror number 7,

Ms. Lopez. Ms. Lopez, if you'd take the first seat here in

the front row.

Juror number 8, Ms. Boggess, please come forward.

Juror number 9, Ms. Freni. Juror number 10, Ms. Delaney.

Juror number 11, Mr. Ramirez -- I'm sorry. Did I do it

again? I did it again. Ms. Ramirez, if you'd come forward

please, with apologies. Juror number 12, Ms. Fierro.

Okay. Our first alternate juror, Mr. Brenzel, if you'd come forward, please, and take the vacant seat in the top row there. Alternate number 2, Mr. Adams. Alternate number 3, Ms. Clark. Ms. Clark, if you'd like, you can come around and sit in this seat right here next to Mr. Bilse in that little stand for the moment.

All right. To the remaining members of the panel,
I want to thank you sincerely for your time, your patience,
your patience with us, with the questionnaire, with your
promptness, your willingness to serve on this case; it is
truly appreciated. And on behalf of all of the U.S. District
judges here in the Southern District of California, I thank
you; I thank you for your time, your service, and your
commitment.

It's interesting. Having gone through the questionnaires, there were several of you with prior jury experience, perhaps not as many as I typically see on a jury panel, and I was thinking as I was going over the questionnaires that it is my sincere hope that before your tour of duty is up, this time here with us, that each and every one of you will have the opportunity, the privilege, to sit on a jury. I think you will find it educational, rewarding, and ultimately unforgettable. And so I leave you with those thoughts.

I ask that you -- actually it's not -- well, we may have an update on some -- okay. I was going to say that you were going to remain on call, but I've been asked to ask you to call after 6 p.m. for further instruction. We do have trials going out this week, next week, and thereafter, so you'll be given further information as to whether you're on call or to otherwise report. It is not necessary for you to return to the jury lounge at this time. So, again, thank you, and perhaps I'll see you on another case at some point.

(The excused panel members left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. We're in the presence of our jurors. Congratulations to each and every one of you. We look forward to working with you. If somebody could pull that door closed in the back of the courtroom. Thank you. I'm not going to swear you as the jury in this case right

now; I'm going to leave that for tomorrow morning. But let me give you some advice and some information. If we were in my courtroom right now, I'd ask you to bend down -- reach down under your seats for your notebooks, and I'd have some instructions for you that you could easily write down. I don't think we have notebooks here, do we, Gaby?

THE CLERK: No.

THE COURT: Okay. But in any event, let me talk about a few housekeeping matters that I know you're very interested in. First of all, we're going to start at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning, and we're going to conduct this trial in the courtroom I occupy, which is Courtroom 16. Remember, you assembled in Courtroom 15 on the fifth floor today? Well, Courtroom 16 is one courtroom down at the end of the hall, and that will be our courtroom for the duration of this trial. So really all you need to remember, first off, is Courtroom 16, fifth floor, tomorrow at 9 a.m. I urge you to be here early, and we will begin just as promptly as we are able to.

I understand that there may be a substantial number of supporters from the Somali community here on behalf of each of these gentlemen who are the defendants in this case. That is perfectly appropriate, and we welcome them. As a matter of fact, we are going to endeavor to create an audio feed for the audio in our courtroom during the trial that can

be fed into the courtroom right next door, Courtroom 15, which is where you were this morning, that is currently not occupied, and so we're hoping that we'll be able to serve some members of the community in that sense who won't be able to find room in our courtroom. Our courtroom is much smaller than this -- you're going to see that tomorrow -- a limited number of seats, about 36, 38 -- 36 seats in the back of the courtroom for the public and spectators and that kind of thing. So there will be a lot of people here milling around and that's fine.

Remember that you will be jurors on this case.

Always try to insulate yourself from any conversation you may overhear about this case, be it coming from spectators or anyone else associated with the trial. Always find a nice quiet place for you to take recesses and more or less be out of the way.

When you report at let's say 8:45, at least for tomorrow until you get your bearings and we can get you situated and find a rhythm in the case, as I say, you'll be brought in just as soon as possible and we'll get going.

I'll have some preliminary instructions for you. The first thing I'll do is swear you, and I'll have some preliminary instructions for you, and then you will hear the opening statements from attorneys. The government proceeds first in every phase of the case; because of the burden of proof, they

have the privilege of proceeding partly because of the tradition of the sequence of events. Keep in mind the defense is under no obligation to make an opening statement; they may decline making an opening statement or defer the making of an opening statement to a later point in time. Then after the opening statements that are to be given, we will proceed with the evidence in the case.

Our trial hours -- and you'll get all of this again tomorrow and you can write some of this down; if you can write it down now, that's fine. Our trial hours are from Monday through -- this going to vary a little bit -- Monday through Friday, trial days Monday through Friday, 9:00 to 12:00 and 1:30 to 4:30. That being said, the first and third Fridays of this month -- this coming Friday, February 1st, and then February 15 -- we will not be in trial. These are calendar days that I have for other cases; I'll be hearing many other matters in the courtroom, so the courtroom just isn't available for trial. So we will not be in session this coming Friday, the 1st, and two weeks after that, Friday, the 15th. I know, Mr. Bilse. I'll get with you in just a moment. And then we have a holiday, Presidents Day, which is the --

THE CLERK: It's the 18th.

THE COURT: Monday, the 18th, so we'll be -- we won't be in session on that day as well. So there you have

three days off. So that takes care of pretty much the time, 9:00 to 12:00, 1:30 to 4:30, a midmorning recess of 15 minutes, a midafternoon recess of 15 minutes, and your noon recess is from 12:00 to 1:30. That may seem a little bit extravagant, but I want to tell you that the attorneys and I appreciate that kind of time during the middle of the day. There are a lot of moving parts to a trial like this; it's more or less the tip of the iceberg that you're seeing, but it takes coordination for a lot of people, and that kind of time during the middle of the day is very helpful. If we need to go beyond 4:30 a bit to finish up a witness or to accommodate a convenient break in the testimony, we'll do that. But typically those will be the hours that we'll keep.

If an emergency arises, we always want you to call us and to let us know whatever that situation might be, illness which is going to prevent you from coming in or some, other emergent circumstance. You can always leave a message with Gaby at her extension, which is area code 619 -- are you going to give them cards? Okay. Have they been handed out? Why don't we hand those cards out. If anything comes up, don't hesitate to give us a call, please, and then we'll act upon it as soon as we can. Okay.

Always wear those badges when you're in and about the courthouse. They readily identify you as jurors, and they help insulate you from any conversation you should not

be privy to. If you're a block from the courthouse in the morning and realize that you've forgotten your badge, don't go back and get it; we've got extras, so keep on coming.

Parking. We're going to get a parking validation machine here, at least the first couple of days. I don't think we're going have it for the duration of the trial, but at least for the first couple of days while you're getting situated and all of that, we'll have -- we'll be able to validate parking for you right in the courtroom, Courtroom 16. Mr. Bilse, you had a scheduling matter you wanted to discuss?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a presentation I have to do at a luncheon next Thursday, and my boss was going to sub it. He cannot do that, so it's probably a couple of hours next Thursday at lunchtime.

THE COURT: Well, can he sub for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He can't.

THE COURT: Oh, he cannot do that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He cannot. I have to make that. And there's about 60 people that are paying to come and listen to me, so it's kind of hard to get out of that.

THE COURT: And this is going to be this coming Thursday or a week from Thursday.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A week from Thursday. 1 THE COURT: From 12:00 to 2:00 did you say? 2 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's in Mission Hills and it's 4 a lunch, so it's from 12:00 to 1:00, but, you know, traveling 5 there and back, I'm not sure how long that would take from 6 here. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Well, we'll work around that. 8 We'll -- if we need to stop a little bit early to get you 9 there -- do you need to be there at 12:00 on the spot? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't have to set it up, so 10 11 I'll try to make it as minimal as possible. THE COURT: Okay. And then get back here just as 12 13 quickly as you can? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Well, any of you have any 16 questions before we let you go for this evening and ask that 17 you return tomorrow morning? I'll have more to tell you 18 about tomorrow morning, but -- you've been taking in an awful 19 lot the last couple of days, and I think we've hit the 20 saturation point. Remember the admonition; it's so very 21 important. You may not discuss this case amongst yourselves 22 or with anyone else or allow yourselves to form or express 23 any opinions until the case has been submitted to you.

It's also very important that you remember you're

not to conduct any independent investigation or inquiry into

24

the facts or the law, into any of the participants in this 1 2 case, into any subject matter that has anything to do with 3 this trial. So as I said before -- yes, Mr. Johnson? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sorry, sir. Quick question. 4 5 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You say we're not supposed to 7 discuss anything, but you mentioned notepads, materials. So 8 will we be leaving the materials that we take, any type of 9 notes or anything here? 10 THE COURT: Yes, yes. You'll be given notebooks. 11 You'll be -- you'll be expected to take notes. You're not required to take notes, but you're expected to take notes, 12 13 and I'll have more to say about the notetaking process tomorrow. You'll be leaving your notebooks here in the 14 courtroom -- not in this courtroom but in Courtroom 16 --15 16 each night. They'll be secure; don't have to worry about 17 that. You don't take them home with you. And you take notes 18 by -- not electronically but the old-fashioned way, writing 19 in your notebooks. Does that answer your question? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. So where was I? 22 THE REPORTER: Don't discuss anything. 23 THE COURT: Oh, yeah, independent investigation or 24 inquiries. I think I covered that. Like I said, you know,

anything that you may see in a newspaper or article or on TV

or the Internet having anything to do with the this case conceivably, or any subject connected with the case, just don't expose yourself to it. All right.

Thank you for your time, your patience. We look forward to working with you on this case. We'll see you tomorrow morning at 8:45, Courtroom 15, then you'll be brought over one courtroom. We'll see you then. Courtroom 16? Okay. Why don't you assemble outside Courtroom 16 or in some other area. It may be that we'll have people in Courtroom 15 tomorrow. So just assemble outside the courtroom before nine o'clock or in some other location close to our courtroom. We'll get you in as soon as we can and get started. Okay. Have a very good evening. We'll see you tomorrow morning.

(The prospective jury left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. We are outside the presence of all jurors. Counsel, are you ready to proceed with deposition rulings?

MS. FONTIER: If I may just collect the notebook again.

THE COURT: This will be a little bit of a tedious process. Do you wish to have your clients here? They're perfectly -- it's perfectly acceptable to have them.

MS. FONTIER: Mr. Moalin would like to stay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Everyone staying?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GHAPPOUR: Yes, your Honor.

MS. MORENO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I had to go back and forth a little I was working with different pleadings and not -- and I think the defense objections were not set forth in a -- in a separate pleading or paper. I think the -- when we reached out to see if one was forthcoming, I think we were advised --I was advised that the objections are right in the transcripts themselves and wouldn't be the subject of a separate pleading. The government did set forth a separate filed -- a pleading entitled United States Objections to Defense Depositions and Response to Defense Objections. And then there was a joint statement of responses and bases for objections in testimony -- in deposition testimony filed by the defense. So I was going back -- I was actually juggling three different sources of objections or responses to objections, looking at these two filings and then looking at the deposition transcripts. So work with me on this. miss something, let me know. I think -- I think I'll be pretty thorough here, but don't hesitate to let me know if I've overlooked something. Okay.

I'm dealing with tape 1 now. There was a -- I saw somewhere that there was an objection by the government to lines 9 through 14 on page 10.

MR. COLE: I think that their page numbering was 1 2 off on that particular one because page 10 --3 THE COURT: I didn't see it. 4 MR. COLE: Our first objection is on page 11. 5 THE COURT: Yeah, I didn't see anything highlighted 6 on page 10, but somewhere I picked up there was an objection 7 from the government to lines 9 through 14. So if there's no objection, then there will be no ruling on page 10. Page 11. 8 MS. FONTIER: So just to be clear then when -- the 9 10 government's just saying that they're withdrawing their 11 objections that they made then, yes? I mean it doesn't matter. It's -- there is an objection right now to --12 THE COURT: I don't know where I got that. I'd 13 14 rather not go through all the individual filings, but --15 MS. FONTIER: Okay, your Honor. Page 11. 16 THE COURT: The diagram was on page 10 that there 17 was an objection to lines 9 through 14. If there was an 18 objection, it's withdrawn. Page 11, the government is 19 objecting to lines 5 through 11. That objection is 20 sustained. The deponent is not being asked what was said, 21 only whether Mr. Moalin's comments were critical. It calls 22 for speculation, lacks foundation as to what is critical. It 23 may be hearsay, but it's sustained on those other grounds. 24 With respect to the government's objection at lines 25 20 to 23, same ruling.

```
The next objection from the government, that comes
 1
 2
     at page 21, line 15 to page 23, line 20. The objection is
 3
    sustained on the basis of -- as hearsay.
 4
               MS. FONTIER: Sorry, your Honor. How far did we
 5
    qo?
 6
               THE COURT: Page 21-15 through 23-20.
 7
               MS. FONTIER: That entire two pages?
 8
               THE COURT: Yes.
 9
               MS. FONTIER: Okay.
10
               MR. COLE: Your Honor, let me note on that one, in
11
     fairness we appreciate the ruling. We are going to play some
12
    part of that call, and so as I sit here right now, I don't
13
    have the portion, and so I just want to note that for the
14
     Court in case this, you know, at that point the defense is
15
    going to --
16
               THE COURT: Well, I may open up the door then --
17
               MR. COLE: Right.
18
               THE COURT: -- Into everything coming in, but as
    of this point --
19
20
               MR. COLE: Yes.
21
               THE COURT: -- the objection would be sustained. I
22
    have a further note on this, that it's sustained on grounds
23
    asserted by the government; it also -- that was hearsay -- it
24
    also lacks foundation as to the conclusion the U.S.
25
     government was overflying Mogadishu.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. FONTIER: So, your Honor, for purposes of editing these tapes when things such as this which are hearsay because the call isn't yet in evidence, I don't know how to deal with that as far as the tape. I mean we can leave it in I guess and then at some point skip -- I'm not entirely sure how to do it, so tell me how we're going to do this.

THE COURT: Well, I think you really need to consider spending some quality time together so you can really work on this. Everything has been telescoped down. This is not a statement that's critical of anyone here, but that's just what is happened. And so I know you've been under a lot of pressure, both sides have been under a lot of pressure, and things were getting to one another late for reasons that are already a matter of record and obviously getting to me late. But we're at the point now where the rubber meets the road, and this jury is coming in to begin the evidence tomorrow. So I know you've got many attorneys here, and you're going to have to create a division of labor where perhaps one or a couple of you are going to have to sit down with one of the attorneys from the government and really work this out. Burn the midnight oil, do whatever you need to do. I can't advise you as to what the best approach --MS. FONTIER: Okay.

THE COURT: -- would be, but you're going to need

to do something that's going to bring about as seamless a 1 2 presentation of the testimony as possible --MS. FONTIER: Yes, your Honor. 3 4 THE COURT: -- once you've got these rulings. 5 So --6 MS. FONTIER: Your Honor, was there some portion 7 from pages 21 through 23 that regardless of if the tape is 8 played it will still not be admissible because your Honor had mentioned some other cases. Or if this -- if the tape is 9 10 played, this is admissible. 11 THE COURT: Well, all I can do is rule upon the objections and the grounds asserted for the objections. 12 13 MS. FONTIER: Okay. 14 THE COURT: In this one particular instance, I --15 with a hope it would be of assistance to the parties -- even 16 went beyond the hearsay objection, letting you know that this 17 testimony was without foundation and there was a conclusion 18 insofar as there was speculation about the U.S. government 19 overflying Mogadishu. So I'm trying to be helpful. If you 20 all agree that some of this is coming in, then you're doing 21 so in light of the objection having been sustained. I hope

MR. COLE: No, no. I don't plan on -- your Honor, I -- we like the Court's ruling. I just -- since they took the deposition -- it's only going to come up maybe once or

22

23

24

25

we don't get bogged down --

twice because I think they took the calls only once or twice during the whole deposition. But since they took them before, you know, this case happened -- their case happened out of order, so to speak. It may be confusing once or twice. But we'll talk to defense counsel.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So I think that was it for tape 1. I'm just making sure that I don't see any defense objections here.

MS. FONTIER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Still on -- okay. We're on tape 2.

Going through tape 2, the first objection is page 13. This is a defense objection. It's highlighted in green. It is overruled. If that's still an objection, its overruled. I had -- I had the impression that some of these objections would be withdrawn in light of other testimony coming in that was unobjected to. I don't know if you've gone back and looked at that through the same lens --

MS. FONTIER: Your Honor, as to that particular objection I don't know why it wasn't withdrawn. It may have just have been somewhere in the confusion of trying to color-code these properly, and I don't think that was an objection that we needed you to sustain.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll go through -I've made the rulings, I'll give you what those rulings are,
and then hopefully that will be helpful for you in putting

together your tapes. So that one was overruled if it wasn't withdrawn.

The next objection I have is from the defense.

It's page 16, line 25 through page 17, line 2. That

objection is overruled, but I also note -- it's overruled on

the ground asserted, but I also note that it's unintelligible

in part. I just didn't really understand what was being

communicated there. But in any event, that objection is

overruled.

I think next, page 21, a defense objection. This objection is sustained. It is to the testimony set forth at page 21, line 21 through 26. Lack of foundation.

I was a little unclear -- the next is page 22, tape 3 -- tape 2, excuse me. Lines -- I see green marking lines 21 through 27. I was a little unclear as to whether this was -- I have a question mark by it. Was this even -- was this being pursued, Ms. Fontier?

MS. FONTIER: Let me ask Mr. Dratel what the source of this objection was.

THE COURT: It just didn't -- it goes -- it goes over to the first two lines of page 23, but it just doesn't seem to add anything. It's the kind of thing that could be eliminated I think.

MS. FONTIER: There's certainly colloquy that needs to be eliminated, but I don't know if there was an objection

that --1 2 MR. DRATEL: That's withdrawn, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Next, I have on page 25, still 4 on tape 2, lines -- lines 3 through 7, sustained on hearsay, 5 lack of foundation, carrying over to lines 11 through 15. So 6 the defense objection there is sustained. 7 Next we're on to tape 3. The government's 8 objection -- I'm looking now at page 6; this is tape 3, page 6, lines 4 through 10. The government's objection is 9 10 sustained on the basis of hearsay as well as lack of 11 foundation. 12 Next, objection from the government, page 11, line 13 25 -- actually 26 -- through page 12, line 15. The 14 government's objection is overruled upon the condition that the word "charity" is stricken. It is without foundation and 15 16 definition. And what remains is defendant Moalin's sending 17 money to people identified by Abdi as "poor." So I guess the 18 takeaway on that is that the word "charity" is stricken. 19 MS. FONTIER: And so that --20 THE COURT: Everything else remains. 21 MS. FONTIER: Does that carry over then into line 2.2 6, my follow-up question; is that correct? Just strike 23 "charity" from my question as well, his answer --24 THE COURT: Yeah, any reference to "charity."

MS. FONTIER: Okay.

THE COURT: Next we have an objection by the defense, page 18, lines 9 -- 9 through 13. That would be overruled. I think a good many of these objections are -- probably would be withdrawn upon further reflection.

Next, on page 21, tape 3, an objection, lines 1 through 4. Overruled. The foundation would be sufficient.

Next, on page 25, lines 4 through 12, the defense objection is overruled, especially in light of prior testimony on page 24. Sometimes there would be testimony that came in unobjected to and then the same or virtually identical testimony would be elicited at a later point in time and there would be an objection. But in any event, the foundation is sufficient there -- is sufficient -- page 25, lines 4 through 12.

MS. FONTIER: And, your Honor, the objection as to the scope was also overruled?

THE COURT: Yes. Well, I had -- I noted that the foundation was sufficient. I think the scope is closely related to that. The position of the government is the deponent lived and worked in Guraceel and could testify to his own knowledge of the events occurring in this small town, which I would -- I would tend to agree with.

MR. COLE: I also -- we took the position also that, unlike witnesses who are going to be here and subject to recall, this was our only chance to ask the witnesses

questions. 1 2 THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. I don't -- I tried not to 3 be overly technical in looking at some of these objections 4 for the reason mentioned by Mr. Cole. You had one crack at 5 it and you know these folks aren't going to be here. 6 MS. FONTIER: I understand. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Then we're on to -- we're on to 8 tape 4 now. The first objection, page 1, lines 21 through 27, then on to page 2, line 1. The objection is overruled. 9 10 This is a defense objection. Overruled. And the defense objections on the rest of that page, page 2, would be 11 overruled. I think that's probably one you would --12 13 MS. FONTIER: These are withdrawn, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: -- would have been happy to withdraw 15 because --16 MS. FONTIER: Those are withdrawn. 17 THE COURT: I wrote myself a note: The defense 18 can't be serious on this. 19 MS. FONTIER: Yeah, those are withdrawn. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Those are overruled on page 2. 21 All right. Next, page 4, first couple of lines there, page 2.2 4, lines 1 through 3. Overruled. Defense objection is 23 overruled.

Next, page 5, defense objection to lines 7 through

14. Overruled. The witness's prior -- just for your

24

```
information, in my view, the witness's prior testimony laid
 1
 2
     the foundation for that. Next, page 9 --
 3
              MS. FONTIER: Your Honor, I would withdraw that.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. On page 9?
 5
              MS. FONTIER: Yes. On 21 through 26?
 6
               THE COURT: Yes.
 7
              MS. FONTIER: Yes, I would withdraw that objection.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay.
 9
              MR. COLE: Wait, your Honor. That was my
10
    objection, wasn't it? Wait a second.
11
              MS. FONTIER: Oh, yeah, it was. No wonder I
     withdraw his objection.
12
13
              MR. COLE: Sorry, your Honor.
14
              MS. FONTIER: I was thinking why would I object to
15
     that.
16
              MR. COLE: Page 9 --
17
               THE COURT: Okay. No, you're right. Here's my
18
    note.
19
              MS. FONTIER: Sorry about that, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: That's okay. Nice try. It's getting
21
    late, but here's the ruling on that.
22
               MR. COLE: I actually withdraw it, your Honor. I
23
    didn't insert it in my chart. I think I looked at it and
24
    realized --
25
               THE COURT: Just for your own edification, this is
```

```
what I had: This wasn't listed on the government -- in the
 1
 2
     government's papers, but I would have been inclined to
 3
    sustain the objection on foundation, plus the answer appears
 4
     to be nonresponsive. Look, you're withdrawing it, so that's
 5
     fine. Okay.
 6
               There was an objection on page 17, lines 19 through
 7
          They weren't color-coded, but I am overruling the
 8
     government's objection. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm ahead of myself.
     I'm already on tape 5 in your papers. No. Strike that.
 9
     There's no -- no further --
10
11
               MR. COLE: Tape 5, page 17, your Honor?
12
               THE COURT: No, no.
13
              MR. COLE:
                          Sorry.
14
               THE COURT: Forget the earlier reference. I was
     one -- I wasn't correlating the tape -- with your papers with
15
     the transcript here. So on the balance of tape 4 there are
16
17
    no further objections. Let's go to tape 5. I think the
18
    first objection I'm dealing with is at page 17. The
19
     government has objected to page 17, lines 19 through 24.
20
     Overruled. Basic history and context for defendant Moalin.
21
     That's how I see this, and I think it's appropriately
22
    admissible. Once again, we're getting into an area what's
23
    sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Where we have
24
     context and a little bit of history, whether it's to humanize
```

the defendant, whether it's to provide some kind of a

historical/cultural reference for Bryden, we're talking essentially the same kinds of things. The parties should be given some license to create a little bit of a backdrop here, so this objection would be overruled.

Tape 6 -- that was it for tape 5. We're on to tape 6 now. The government's first objection is page 5, lines 19 through 26. That objection is overruled. The objection is relevance. Overruled. It goes over -- the objection goes over to page 6, line 6. Same ruling. Then the next would be page 6, line 15 through lines 28. Overruled on the same -- on the same ground. Next, page 6 -- excuse me, page -- well, you have two objections there.

MR. COLE: Yes.

THE COURT: Yeah. There's an overlap of objections. In any event, the testimony from page 6, line 15 through page 7, line 22, all of that is overruled. Those are government's objections; they're overruled on the grounds asserted. Then when we get to page 7, line 24 through page 8, line 3, the government's objection is sustained on relevance and hearsay. Okay.

Page -- next is page 8, line 22 through page 11, line 10. I'm inclined to sustain this. I'll tell you why. If it were coming in here live -- I'm inclined to sustain it on the basis of relevance; that's the ground the government asserted here. My note here is I'm inclined to sustain it as

it relates only to the witness's drought relief work and doesn't involve Mr. Moalin.

MS. FONTIER: So, your Honor, would the picture itself be admissible then? And just to take out of this the description of Farah Yare, who's one of the people pictured in this copy --

I really don't know. I'm just looking at the testimony itself. And if any photograph or diagram that was inextricably interwoven here would also be out, but if the diagram or photograph comes in for other purposes or it's stipulated that it can come in because it shows an area of drought relief, for example, is going to be used in connection with other testimony, the other testimony of other witnesses, okay. I have to leave that to your common sense and your ability to work this out. But the evidence -- the testimony itself is not relevant. I would keep it out on 403 grounds.

MS. FONTIER: Can I have one moment, please? Your Honor, I'm slightly confused because there's two different photographs in this list that --

THE COURT: I wasn't even considering the photographs. I'm considering the testimony.

MS. FONTIER: So strike the portions of the testimony regarding --

THE COURT: The testimony is stricken. If the photographs come in at a later -- in connection with later testimony by this deponent or other deponents or it comes in through agreement with the parties, that's fine, but -- MS. FONTIER: All right. Your Honor, I would just --

THE COURT: I can't -- we just don't have the time to argue these. And, quite frankly, I did these so long ago now that the context of all of this -- I'd have to probably review the entire testimony of a deponent once again to appreciate what your concern here is or what your request is. I'm just giving you rulings on the objections that were made.

MS. FONTIER: Okay.

THE COURT: I would suggest you take down the rulings, and if there's something that gives you so much heartburn you can't proceed, without making a pitch, then we'd look at it at some later time, but I know you need these rulings to --

MS. FONTIER: Well, your Honor, my only concern on this particular portion of the ruling is that these like questions going into this were just to lay a proper foundation for the admission of the photographs so that I could later question the witness about what was in the photographs and --

THE COURT: This witness or another witness?

MS. FONTIER: Both. The next -- this whole section that we're talking about.

THE COURT: Well, is there any unobjected-to testimony later or is it all objected to on the basis. Does the photograph come in through any other witness? Can it come in through any other witness?

MS. FONTIER: I admitted it through this witness, but --

MR. COLE: Yeah, I don't know if they can -- if they have other witnesses that get it in or not at trial, but we object to its relevance here, and we object to --

THE COURT: I don't know if the photograph is independently relevant in connection with other evidence or not, but we do need to move on, so --

MS. FONTIER: All right.

THE COURT: If the photograph is inextricably tied to the testimony and there's no other basis to get it in, I'm sustaining the objection to the testimony on the ground asserted. You know, it's five o'clock now. I know the marshals need to get these gentleman back in, so we have a couple of choices now. We can continue on -- I'm happy to continue on if you want to waive the presence of your clients at this point or we can pick up again early in the morning, before nine o'clock, but I know that that imposes a hardship on the marshals. I know that every hour -- every hour we

advance any proceeding here I'm informed that these gentlemen 1 2 have to get up an hour earlier, and they're getting up early 3 enough as it is, so I want them to get their rest as well. 4 MS. FONTIER: Mr. Moalin is definitely choosing to 5 waive his presence for the remainder of this evening. 6 MS. MORENO: The same for Mr. Mohamud. 7 MR. GHAPPOUR: Mr. Doreh as well. THE COURT: Okay. All counsel have waived the 8 9 presence of their --10 MR. DURKIN: That's right, Judge. THE COURT: -- clients at this point for the 11 12 purpose of continuing on. That will relieve our interpreters 13 as well. And then we'll just continue on. Ms. Fontier, I 14 know that you've picked up the laboring oar on this part of 15 the proceedings, that is, deposition testimony. Other 16 counsel are free to remain if they'd like to hear what the 17 rulings are or they're free to --18 MR. DURKIN: That's what I was going to ask, Judge, if we can be excused. 19 20 THE COURT: -- free to take your leave. We'll --21 and the same goes for the government. If only one of you 22 wants to remain behind, I'll work with you, continue on with 23 the rulings and go as far as we can. I've got to leave here 24 within an hour.

MS. FONTIER: Okay.

THE COURT: Are we breaking then for those leaving? 1 2 MS. FONTIER: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: For those of you leaving, please take all of your articles, take your papers; we won't be back here 4 5 in this courtroom again. 6 MS. FONTIER: Your Honor --7 THE COURT: That's okay. No, no, I never like to 8 break in. 9 MS. FONTIER: You need a big gavel like they have 10 on TV. 11 THE COURT: Only in movies and television. Okay. We're going to continue on, and we're going to have Ms. 12 13 Fontier and Mr. Cole. You ready to go? 14 MR. COLE: Ready to go. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Ghappour is leaving. Okay. 16 Ready to go? Mr. Dratel, you going to hang in there with us? 17 You are taking off? 18 MR. DRATEL: I have too much to take care of. I 19 would love to, but --20 THE COURT: Counsel, thank you for all the patience 21 and cooperation in selecting the jury. I know we were 22 pushing pretty -- at a pretty good pace there over two days, 23 but I appreciate getting this jury selection done on time so 24 that we can work within the schedule. I think you were all 25 anticipating starting the case on Wednesday, tomorrow.

Okay. Let's get to -- we're still on tape 6, page 11, line 27 through page 12, line 3. The objection is -- the government's objection is sustained on the ground asserted. Page 13, line 20 through page 14, line 5, the objection is sustained on basis of lack of foundation. Page 16, lines 4 to 22. The objection is sustained on the basis of relevance.

MS. FONTIER: Your Honor, I just want to make a record on that point.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. FONTIER: Which is this photograph depicts

Farah Shidane, Farah Yare, who is called by the government
one of the unindicted co-conspirators who we were unable to
call as a witness because we could not get safe passage for
him. But I do think that any testimony related to him if
he's -- particularly if he's an unindicted co-conspirator is
of particular relevance.

that. I would sustain the objection on the basis of relevance, 403. This is to lines 4 through 18. It's of minimal probative value, and it's also cumulative. Now, with respect to the testimony on page 16, line 23 through page 18, line 12, this is one of the very few areas where I was going to indicate my tentative thought because I see this as a significant objection -- I mean it's a significant matter, and I'm inclined to sustain this. Originally the witness's

testimony seem to be based on his own knowledge. Here he admits his information about defendant's work for -- or plans and drought relief were told to him by Shidane and other committee members.

Now, you know, the fact that Shidane didn't want to go to Djibouti to get his deposition taken is really a crying shame. You know, if he had some inordinate fear that he was going to get snapped up, the government I think was on record as indicating they had absolutely no intention of doing that, so Shidane made a decision on his part not to appear for his deposition. And I just think that if he purposefully unavailed himself of the opportunity to -- to appear for his deposition, then this does not come in, that is, information that he might have provided does not come in through hearsay. That's my inclination here.

MS. FONTIER: And, your Honor, I do have to object to that sort of recitation of the facts. The government, which we made very clear I think in multiple Rule 15 filings/request for safe passage and motioned related to Mr. Shidane. The government stated, as your Honor said, that they had no intention of arresting him, but they would not put that in a written letter; they wouldn't say we won't arrest him. And we went back and forth with the government on this issue, just requesting just even a statement, a letter, a simple letter saying they would not affect his

arrest, and when push came to shove, they would not give us that in writing.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. FONTIER: They wouldn't say it. So the issue --

THE COURT: The issue has been joined. I want to give you an opportunity to make your record; I think you're doing that. But the issue has been joined, as you correctly point out in prior motion work here. I don't know what can be added at this point. All I can do is say that the government's objection here is well-taken.

MS. FONTIER: Again, your Honor, just for the record, you know, this is -- we believe that he is -- was called a co-conspirator when he in fact is not. He would have offered exculpatory evidence and was made unavailable because they would not offer him safe passage.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's continue on then.

That takes cakes of testimony through page 18, line 12. Then we have page 18, line 13 through page 22, line 10. The government's objection is sustained generally on relevance grounds without tying defendant Moalin to any particular project. That's also an inadequate foundation for the business record exception under 803 (6). All right. Tape 7, page 13 --

MS. FONTIER: Sorry, your Honor. How far did

that --

THE COURT: For as long as the objection went.

MS. FONTIER: It goes all the way through page 22?

THE COURT: Yeah, line 10. Okay. We have tape 7 through now, page 13, lines 4 through 10. The government's

through now, page 13, lines 4 through 10. The government's objection is overruled. Page 17, line 3 through 9. If

government's objection is withdrawn.

On to tape 8, page 3, lines 21 through 24. The government's objection is overruled. Page 5, line 19 through page 6, line 28. All of the objections of the government are sustained. Page 7, line 1 through page 10, lines 12. The objections are sustained.

I think -- the next defense objection, page 13, I think that's one you probably want to withdraw, but if not, the objection is overruled. Up to you whether or not you want to withdraw that.

MS. FONTIER: Yeah, that's withdrawn, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that -- I think that does it for -- let's see -- page 17. The objection is overruled. That may be another one you want to just withdraw some testimony. You might want to withdraw upon further reflection, but I'm overruling the defense objection there.

MS. FONTIER: Yeah, either way.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. FONTIER: Overruled or withdraw is fine by me.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT: Okay. I'll mark it as withdrawn.
Next, page 20, lines 22 through 26. I think it falls into
the same category; it's either withdrawn or overruled, your
choice.
          MS. FONTIER: Did we skip page 19?
          THE COURT: If we did --
          MS. FONTIER: Page 19, line --
          THE COURT: Yeah, page 19, lines 4 through 15 would
be overruled. As I say, you may want to go through so many
of your objections that would appear to be appropriate for
withdrawing. But in any event, I'll give you the rulings
now. Page 20, lines 22 through 26 and on to page 21 through
lines 2, 1 and 2. The objection of the defense is overruled.
And same ruling for page 23, lines 8 through 10.
          Tape 9, page 1. The objection of the defense at
lines 5 through 11 would be overruled, especially in light of
the answer.
          MS. FONTIER: I believe I withdrew that.
          THE COURT: Okay. Nobody told me.
          MR. COLE: I'm sorry. Tape 9, page 1, 6 through
11?
          THE COURT:
                      Yes.
          MR. COLE: Thank you, your Honor.
          THE COURT:
                      That's overruled. I mean withdrawn
apparently. Okay. Page 2, lines 12 through 18. The defense
```

```
objection would be overruled in light of the responsive
 1
 2
     answer. You may want to withdraw that, but the ruling is
 3
    overruled.
 4
               MS. FONTIER: I guess I have a -- this one is not
 5
    color-coded; that's why I'm confused. Sorry, this particular
 6
    tape of mine, but I can work with it.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. Page 3, defense objection, lines
 8
     13 through 19, overruled in light of the answer and prior
 9
    testimony. Page 6, lines 1 through 19. The objection is
10
     overruled. This goes to the witness's understanding of
11
     al-Shabaab and the threat posed in '07 to '08. Page 7,
12
     lines 6 through 11, overruled. Page 11, the only objection I
13
    see is at lines 10 through 22 in light of the unobjected-to
14
    prior testimony. So if you look to the testimony from lines
     1 through 9, which came in without objection, and then you
15
16
     look at the testimony, the objected-to the testimony from the
17
     defense, lines 11 through 22, it's -- the objection is
18
     overruled in light of the unobjected-to prior testimony.
19
               MS. FONTIER: I'm sorry, your Honor. What page are
20
            I'm totally lost.
     we on?
               THE COURT: Page 11.
21
22
               MS. FONTIER: Page 11 of tape 9?
23
               MR. COLE: Yes.
24
               THE COURT: Yes.
```

MR. COLE: It's 11 through 22.

```
MS. FONTIER: I don't see an objection.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Well, it's color-coded here in green.
 3
               MS. FONTIER: I think I must have printed the wrong
 4
     -- I mean I don't have any objections on this one, so I'm
 5
    assuming that this type of mine is the wrong color, the
 6
    wrong --
 7
               MR. COLE: The objection was at line 22
 8
     specifically I think.
 9
               MS. FONTIER: Right. I'm looking at this and I
     don't even have the word "objection" on here, so that's why
10
11
     I'm concerned now that I'm totally off base here.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. So objection withdrawn then on
13
    page 11? Well, the objection -- the color-coding I'm looking
14
    at is from line 10, the question starting at line 10 and a
15
    half there through 22. The objection is overruled in light
16
     of the unobjected-to prior testimony.
17
               MR. COLE: Just to save time, I'll sit next to her
18
    with my copy because I --
19
               MS. FONTIER: I just lost --
20
               THE COURT: Okay.
21
               MS. FONTIER: Because this -- we're on a different
22
    page totally.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. Ready?
24
               MR. COLE:
                         Yes.
25
               MS. FONTIER: Yes, your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Okay. Continuing on, now we probably won't have that problem anymore. All right. Here we go again. Page 17, I see green, lines 11 through 23. The objection is overruled if it's still being pursued.

MS. FONTIER: It is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Page 18, lines 19 through 22, overruled. Page 19, testimony -- there's an objection to lines 1 through 4. Overruled, especially in light of the answer at line 6. Page 21, it's overruled in light of other unobjected-to testimony regarding Shongole and also on the basis of relevance and -- on the basis of relevance.

Next, page 23, the objection is overruled; that's lines 11 through 16. Next, page 24, lines 6 through 10, the objection is overruled. Now we're on to tape 10. You with me?

MS. FONTIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Tape 10, okay? Okay. It starts on page 1, line 24 through page 2, line 14. Each of the objections would be overruled, the hearsay objections. Next, we have page 3, I've got lines 3 through 17 in green indicating a defense objection. It would be overruled. This testimony concerns -- or the questions inquire into the witness's knowledge and familiarity with Yare, gone into extensively on direct examination, so I don't know -- I don't understand why it would be objected to on cross-examination.

1 Be that as it may.

Page 4, the objection is -- this is defense objection -- the objection is sustained to lines -- from lines 2 to 23 in light of the objections and clarifications. Sustained as to lines 2 through 23. Overruled as to line 24 on page 4 through line 5 on page 5.

Next, we have page 6, objection to testimony from page 6, line 15 through page 7, line 10. The defense objection is to -- the objection is overruled.

Next, we have on page 10, line 23 through page 11 line 5. The objection is overruled in light of testimony on page 11, particularly at lines 21 and 23. Turn to page 14, please.

MS. FONTIER: Of --

THE COURT: No, there's no objection there.

MS. FONTIER: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Tape 10, page 20. The government's objection here is overruled. The answer is self-limiting as to foundation. Next, page 21, lines 14 through 27 and onto the following page through line 21. The government's objection is sustained on the basis of relevance. Okay. We're on to tape 11. Page 2 -- you with me?

MS. FONTIER: Yeah, I just want to make -THE COURT: Tape 11, page 2, line 22 to page 3,

```
line 11. This is the government's objection. It is
 1
 2
     overruled. It is overruled. This provides some context for
 3
     defendant's family and witness's knowledge of defendant
 4
              That one is overruled.
 5
               Next, page 4, lines 10 through 14. Government's
 6
    objection is overruled on the stated ground of relevance and
 7
    later testimony clarifies without any objection. Page 20 --
    page 5, lines 14 through 17. Government's objection is
 8
    sustained.
 9
               Next objection I see would be page 18. It's a
10
11
     defense objection. The defense is conceding that these are
12
     ill-taken, so the objection is withdrawn.
13
               Next, page 19. Are you on page 19? I've got
14
     defense objections from lines 4 through 12 and 18 through the
15
    bottom of the page on to line 1 of page 20.
16
               MR. COLE: I'm sorry, your Honor. For 18, 19, and
17
     20, we were basically just agreeing with their objections.
18
               THE COURT: Okay.
19
               MS. FONTIER: Okay.
20
               THE COURT: Okay. So sustained. I was confused
21
     about that.
22
               MR. COLE:
                          Sorry.
23
              MS. FONTIER: I'm confused about this as well
24
    because is this --
25
```

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. FONTIER: I'm just -- I just would like if I can look at the government's because I think this version of mine has the names interspersed, so I'm not sure who's talking when. Okay. That makes a lot more sense. My version has my name where Caroline Han's should be, and I didn't think these were the questions I would be asking. So those are sustained.

MR. COLE: Yes.

MS. FONTIER: Thank you, your Honor. Ready to go.

THE COURT: Okay. Page 22, lines 1 through 4. The defense objection is sustained. And the term "brag" is ambiguous. That's what I have in my note. Okay.

What are we to? Tape 12. Okay. First -- the first real substantial objection here, page 7, line 10 through page 10, line 7. Lot of material there, and here's the ruling. The government's objection to this testimony regarding the orphan center in the Guraceel area in '06, '08 is overruled. The testimony is somewhat confusing, but appears to lay a proper foundation for such an endeavor with some funding from the "diaspora" -- quotes around diaspora -- it provides some linkage to the defendant's position that money was sent for purposes other than supporting al-Shabaab. So basically the objection -- the basis for the objection is just too narrow a ground to bar the testimony. Okay.

MR. COLE: Where did that go into? Where did that

```
run to, your Honor?
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Well, it's your objection from page --
 3
     this is tape 12, page 7, line 10 --
 4
               MR. COLE:
                         Yes.
 5
               THE COURT: All the way to page 10, line 7.
 6
               MR. COLE: Okay. Gotcha. I'm sorry. That's a
 7
    yes, your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay.
               MR. COLE: "Gotcha" is a little informal.
 9
10
    apologize.
11
               THE COURT: I'm begging for a little informality at
12
     this point. Anything that will help pass the time.
13
               MR. COLE: Okay.
14
               THE COURT: Okay. Then we have page 10, line 20
15
     through page 11, line 5. Same ruling, overruled. Then we
16
    have page 11, line 13 through page 12, line 10. Government's
17
    objection is overruled. Next, we have page 21, lines 1
18
     through 17. Well, before that, before we get to page 21,
     there's a defense objection, page 18, the defense objection,
19
20
     lines 3 through 22, sustained. There was a lack of
21
     foundation for the question but even the answer was
22
    nonresponsive.
23
               Page 21, the government is objecting, lines 1
24
    through 16 or 17. The government's objection is sustained.
25
    Next, page 22, line 12 through page 23, line 3. The
```

objections are sustained. Also there's a hearsay issue, but you've got speculation, foundation, and hearsay is indicated in the government's pleading.

Next, page 24. I think this may be an area where the defense wants to withdraw the objection, but in any event, it's overruled. This is page 24, line 23 through page 25, line 11. The area of testimony previous -- this is an area of testimony previously explored by both sides as well as later, so it seemed to be one of those areas -- look at 16 through 18: Same subject, no objection. Okay.

Here we go. Tape 13. I think the first objection is at page 18, lines 4 through 7. The government's objection is overruled. This may be received as or considered as information received by the witness. Next, page 24, lines 2 through 11. I'm going to sustain this. I didn't see any prior testimony in this witness's testimony with any indication that he handled or directed funds from the diaspora. The objection is sustained. And I don't know that his early reference to collecting money and livestock made any reference to the diaspora. I just think that that was his job amongst the local — the local folks there, not the diaspora.

Okay. Next we're on to tape 14. The government's objection, first objection --

MS. FONTIER: What page, your Honor?

```
THE COURT: Pardon me?
 1
 2
              MS. FONTIER: We're on tape 14.
 3
               THE COURT: Tape 14. Turn to page 12, tape 14.
 4
     This is the first objection I encountered.
 5
               MS. FONTIER: Yes.
 6
               THE COURT: The government's objection is from
     lines 15 through 25. Overruled. Page 13, the government's
 7
 8
     objection, lines 5 through 9, overruled. The government's
 9
     objection --
              MR. COLE: The defense objection?
10
11
               THE COURT: Excuse me. No, there is no objection
12
     there. I see no objection. Page 16, I see no objection.
13
              MR. COLE: Page 16 of tape 14.
14
               THE COURT: Yes. There was just a note to myself.
15
              MR. COLE: Okay.
16
               THE COURT: Okay. Next objection, page 21 at lines
17
    17 through 25. It doesn't really seem like an objection to
18
    me.
         I don't know --
              MS. FONTIER: I think it was a --
19
20
    misstates-the-testimony sort of objection, but I think we'll
21
    just withdraw it at this point.
22
               THE COURT: Okay. Same thing -- let's see -- page
23
     22, lines 12 through 14. It's kind of a no harm, no foul.
24
              MS. FONTIER: Yes, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: Okay.
```

MS. FONTIER: I mean the objection was to sort of the form of the question and the answer asked him to rephrase the question, so it's withdrawn.

THE COURT: Okay. Then we have objection on page 24, line 20. This is a defense objection, page 24, line 20 through page 25, line 9. Is that being pursued? I've got it as overruled. If you don't want to withdraw it, it's overruled.

MS. FONTIER: Your Honor, I think that those -- I highlighted those because I wasn't sure what was happening because there was the overlap, and it seems the objections may have been to form as Judge Gallo ruled on them.

THE COURT: Well, do you want to withdraw that?

MS. FONTIER: They can be withdrawn, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. That takes care of tape 14 I believe. Next we're on to tape 15, page 6. I have a note here, what is the defendant's objection? The question was not answered. And I also have objected to in light of unobjected-to testimony on the next page, particularly at lines 8 through 17. You want to withdraw that? It's overruled in any event. It's up to you.

MS. FONTIER: I'm confused. I guess it's withdrawn because I don't know what the basis might be. I'm very confused by that objection too.

THE COURT: Why don't you -- I think it would be

```
better if you just withdrew that.
 1
 2
               MS. FONTIER: I'll withdraw that.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. We're getting there, lady and
 4
     gentleman. Okay. Then we have page 16, line 23 through
 5
     19 -- actually through page 20, line 1. The defense
 6
    objection to this line of questioning is overruled. But the
 7
     transcript really needs to be cleaned up. You've got an
 8
    awful lot of argument and statements of counsel there. So
     the objection is overruled, but please clean that one up.
 9
10
    It's got a lot of underbrush in there.
11
               Okay. Next, page 22, lines 12 through 16.
     Overruled, defense objection overruled.
12
13
               MS. FONTIER: Sorry, what page, your Honor?
14
               THE COURT: Page 22.
15
               MS. FONTIER: There was issue with page 18 -- so
16
     this is page 18 through 20?
17
               THE COURT: Page 16 -- from page 16 -- you got
18
     running objections to all the testimony from page 16, line 23
19
     all the way to page 18.
20
               MS. FONTIER: That's right.
               THE COURT: Excuse me. All the way to page 20,
21
22
     line 1. And so I'm overruling the objections there but
23
     telling you you really need to clean up the transcript there,
24
    the tape.
```

MR. COLE: It's all attorney discussion.

MS. FONTIER: Right. This was a very awkward portion whether there was -- issues of the interpreter interpreting a Somali word and we're --

through 16 and lines 24 through 28. The objection would be overruled, objections. And then that went over to -- carried over to page 23, line 1 and then there's another objection, page 23, lines 5 through 15, defense objection overruled.

And then finally page 24, line 8 through page 25, line 19. I have I need further comment from counsel. I guess I just didn't understand that very well.

MR. COLE: As I understand this one -- Ms. Fontier can tell me if I'm wrong -- this was one where they thought I was going to ask a series of questions based on my understanding of what is said in an audio call that their translator may disagree with that. And may be the case. I mean they may have their own translation, but I needed to be able to ask the witness about what we believe the call means and based my examination based on the evidence we're going to offer. And so that's why I thought -- it's right not an objection. It's they could have asked the same witness about their view of the translation if they wanted to.

THE COURT: Okay. Is --

MS. FONTIER: I think that's basically correct, your Honor. The question that is -- it refers to Hassan

```
Dahir Aweys is -- particularly his name we believe is not in
 1
 2
     this particular translation; it's a different name that is
 3
    translated according to our interpreter. So I mean if
 4
     this -- this is one of the things we're never going to able
 5
    to agree on. What I guess I would suggest is we just take
 6
    out the portions that are nontestimonial when we're going --
 7
     Josh is going back and forth --
 8
               THE COURT: Can you two work it out, what's going
 9
    to be cleaned up?
10
               MS. FONTIER: Yes, no problem.
               MR. COLE:
11
                          Sure.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. I'll indicate the objection is
13
    withdrawn but you'll be cleaning that up. Well, thank you.
14
               MR. COLE: Thanks for staying late, your Honor, and
15
     your staff.
16
               THE COURT: And my what?
17
               MR. COLE: And your staff for staying late.
18
               THE COURT: Yes, yes. You're welcome. Let me ask
19
    you something. How long do you think opening statements will
20
    be tomorrow?
21
               MR. COLE: I think that ours will be less than 30
22
    minutes.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. How about the defense?
     idea? Have you discussed this? Do you know?
24
25
              MS. FONTIER: Well, given that there are four makes
```

```
it slightly more difficult, but I think that the longest will
 1
 2
     probably be 30, 35 minutes, and I think sort of in order,
 3
     they'll get shorter and shorter.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. Listen, let's make Judge
 5
    Gonzalez happy. She's been very generous, so let's leave no
 6
     trace, as we say in backpacking.
          (There was a break in the proceedings for the evening
 7
 8
     recess.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

Certificate of Reporter I hereby certify that I am a duly appointed, qualified, and acting Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the mentioned cause on the date or dates listed on the title page of the transcript; and that the format used herein complies with the rules and requirements of the United States Judicial Conference. Dated January 9, 2014 at San Diego, California. Debra M. Henson /s/ Debra M. Henson (electronic) Debra M. Henson Official Court Reporter